#### THE

# CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº LXXXII. JANUARY 1896.

## ART I.-ANGLICAN ORDERS.

### PART I.

- I. The Times, Oct.-Dec. 1894.
- 2. The Guardian, 1894 and 1895.
- 3. Les Ordinations Anglicanes. Par FERNAND DALBUS. (Arras, 1894.)
- 4. English Orders: whence obtained. By Rev. J. B. SMITH. (London, 1894)
- The Attitude of the Church of England to Non-episcopal Ordinations. By W. K. FIRMINGER. (Oxford, 1894.)
- 6. Tractatus Canonicus de Sacra Ordinatione, auctore PETRO GASPARRI. (Paris, 1893.)
- Etude Théologique sur les Ordinations Anglicanes. Par A. BOUDINHON. (Paris, 1895.)
- 8. Etudes Religieuses, 15 Mars, 15 Avril, 15 Juillet 1895; and Partie Bibliographique, 30 Juin 1894. (Paris.)
- 9. Bulletin Critique, 15 Juillet 1894. (Paris.)
- De Apostolische Opvolging in de Anglicaansche Kerk. (Amsterdam, 1894.)
- De Validitate Ordinum Anglicanorum. Responsio ad Batavos, scriptore I. WORDSWORTH, S.T.P. (London, 1894.)
- De Hierarchi
   Anglican
   auctoribus DENNY et LACEY.
   (Londini, 1895.)
- 13. Revue Bénédictine, Décembre 1894, Mars 1895. (Belgique.)
- 14. Revue Internationale de Théologie, Janvier-Mars 1895. (Berne.)
- 15. De la Validité des Ordinations Anglicanes. Lettre à l'épiscopat vieux-catholique de Hollande. (Rotterdam, 1895.)
  - VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

the But

to not

her

ore ent (7). and tter

ids,

n it.

ind

ime

ose

pr

CO

se

ma

of

his

suc

Ba

ass

wh

15

Ed

on

all

thr

allo

We

tion

det

cou

reci

the

alor

the

Hol

Aby

Pati

such

dete

as a

Chu

of co

led s

euch

Fath

prec

man is pr

opini

tury

16. The Tablet, 1895.

17. Revue Catholique des Revues, 20 Août 1895. (Paris.)

18. The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, Jan. 1895. (Dublin.)

19. Reasons for rejecting Anglican Orders. By F. S. SMITH, S.J. (London, 1895.)

20. The Bishop of Oxford's Second Charge. (Oxford, 1893.)

21. What Objections have been made to English Orders? By F. E. BRIGHTMAN. (London, 1895.)

Two years ago the old controversy upon Anglican Orders broke out again. M. Fernand Dalbus, after making the acquaintance of Lord Halifax in the winter of 1889, became interested enough in the subject to devote a study to it in La Science Catholique of Dec. 1893 and Jan. 1894. brochure directed attention to the question abroad. Cardinal Vaughan, in an address upon Reunion, delivered in the autumn of 1894, reopened the matter at home. A flood of newspaper correspondence, pamphlets, articles and solid books set in at once from all sides, nor has it yet abated. dinhon has but just finished his retractations 1—to use an Augustinian word—which he found necessary after the perusal of Messrs. Denny and Lacey's De Hierarchia Anglicanâ; and other papers are expected, not to mention the official decision now in progress at Rome. A remark of M. Boudinhon's earlier pamphlet aptly characterises the new phase of the controversy: 'La discussion relative aux ordinations anglicanes ne porte plus guère sur l'histoire, mais sur la valeur théologique ' (p. 9, n. 11). It is a liturgical, a theological, a juridico-canonical dispute.

Some, however, still remain who, after all that has been ascertained by writers like Haddan, and admitted by others like Lingard and Estcourt, yet venture to tell off the historical argument against Anglican Orders on the simple ground that no documentary record of Barlow's consecration exists. Thus Dom Bede Camm concludes 'il est au moins douteux que Barlow ait été consacré.' 2 Father Breen reminds 'his Anglican friends . . . that the first principle of all sound historical criticism is "Factum non præsumitur sed probatur." 3 Father Tournabize is content with less, and observes, 'Il nous semble que ce fait, tout probable qu'il est, n'est pas suffisam-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We have been unable to obtain this second series of papers by M. Boudinhon in the original, and have been obliged to content ourselves with the summaries in the Guardian of November 6 and December 4, 1895. <sup>2</sup> Rev. Bén. Dec. 1894, p. 533.

<sup>3</sup> Guardian, Dec. 5, 1894.

ın.

Η,

By

ers

he

me

in Tis

nal

the

of

oks

ou-

an

the gli-

the

of

new

ina-

ir la

neo-

oeen

hers

rical

und

cists.

teux his

ound r." 3

nous

sam-

rs by

selves

ber 4,

ment établi; et tant que les anglicans n'apporteront pas de preuve plus décisive, un légitime doute persistera.' So 'the conclusion to which the balance of probabilities points' Father S. Smith 'is not indeed that Barlow was certainly not consecrated, but that there is serious ground for suspecting that he may not have been.'2 Let us once more set out, for the sake of clearness, the bare facts that are known of Barlow and

his movements in 1534-6.

But here we must interrupt with a caveat. The apostolic succession in the English Church does not stand or fall with Barlow's consecration. In consecrating Parker, he had three associates, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkin, the last of whom was consecrated by the old Pontifical, on December 9. The fact that they departed from the rubric of Edward's Ordinal by all repeating the formula at the laying on of hands, shows that they acted deliberately, and meant all to act on an equal footing. There is nothing to show that three doubted the orders of the fourth. Could they have allowed themselves to be associated with him if they had? We can assign no reason for this obviously intended deviation but that, in the absence of a metropolitan, they all four determined to act on a level. But it is asserted that they could not; and by M. Boudinhon that, after all, only Barlow recited the 'form' 'Almighty God,' &c.: and that therefore the succession does hinge upon the principal, and upon him alone. To the latter contention there is a triple reply. First, the defect, if there be any, is covered by the decisions of the Holy Office in 1704, confirmed in 1860, upon the case of the Abyssinians. Giving due weight to the explanations of Cardinal Patrizzi (1875), this decision still establishes the principle that such a 'form' as 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,' being of course determined by the general intention of the rite, must be taken as a sufficient form of ordination.3 Secondly, the Roman Church has not yet made up its mind what is the 'form' of consecration. It is true that comparative liturgiology has led scholars like Duchesne and Gasparri to seek for it in the eucharistic original of our 'Almighty God and most merciful Father.' Yet in the Roman rite this follows, as in ours it precedes, the imposition of hands, and is only said 'extensis manibus ante pectus.' But though this opinion as to the 'form,' is probably true, it cannot be described either as the general opinion or as one of long standing. In the sixteenth century both sides took 'Accipe,' &c., for the 'form' of the

8 Cf. De Hierarchiâ Anglicanâ, § 352.

<sup>1</sup> Etudes, 15 Mars, 1895, p. 414. <sup>2</sup> Month, Dec. 1894, p. 569.

be

th

cle

pr

or

in

Ye

fav

wit

we

op

est for

mi

In

pra

tim

hol

om

rite

din

min

the

with

St:

this

the

sinn

me.

the

regu

agai

chie

quot

as I

theo

CO-0

the i

that

did

other

episcopate. From Vasquez down to the theologians of the present century, the same opinion has continued. Dens, for instance, in answer to the question, 'What is the matter and form of the Episcopate?' answers that 'it is sufficiently agreed amongst the authors that imposition of hands under the form "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum" is the matter.' Accordingly, Gasparri (n. 1109) says, 'Communis sententia est materiam esse impositionem manuum episcopi consecrantis et formam esse relativa verba "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum"; and though he himself adopts the modern and more historical view as to what the 'form' was (n. 1092), he ranges himself with the 'communis sententia' as to what it now is, and confesses:—

'In hypothesi impositionis manuum episcopi cum solis illis verbis "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," absque præfatione, admittimus cum communi sententia ordinationem esse validam, quia licet illa sola verba in se inspecta sint indeterminata, et non satis exprimant collationem ordinis episcopalis, tamen satis determinantur non solum præfatione sed etiam ipsamet cærimonia sine præfatione' (n. 1109).

Thirdly, as it thus appears, no 'form' can be demanded, but words which, either in themselves or by virtue of accompanying prayers, suitably express the Order to be conferred. the Anglican formula of 1552, 'Take the Holy Ghost and remember,' &c., satisfies all that is required. For it recites the words which St. Paul used of the Bishop Timothy, and occurs in close conjunction with the prayer which M. Boudinhon himself now admits to be a valid 'form' for the episcopate.2 Further, when it is remembered that the words which the Greeks adopt for the 'form' of episcopal consecration neither are nor ever have been the same as the successive 'forms' of the Latin rite, and that the Latins could not afford to be tied down to the assertion that the recitation of the 'form' must exactly synchronise with the moment of imposition of hands, it becomes impossible to maintain that because Barlow alone recited 'Almighty,' &c., the other three who joined in at 'Take the Holy Ghost,' &c., had no part or lot in passing on the succession.

But there remains the other allegation. Though all four recited the words, they could not transmit it, because in any case only the principal consecrates, and the rest are but witnesses or assistants. But this will not hold. It might have some colourable ground where only the principal recites the words of consecration. 'Accipe,' &c., has just been proved to

<sup>1</sup> Theol. Moral. et Dogm. : De Ordine, n. 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Guardian, Nov. 6, 1895.

e

7(

d d

m

y,

m

m

gh

to

ne

ois

ım

ba

em

ne

out

ıy-

Šo

re-

he

and

ou-

co-

the

her

ms'

be

rm'

n of

low

d in

sing

four

any

wit-

have

s the

ed to

be a valid form of consecration, and here, by departing from the rubric in order to recite it, Barlow's three associates clearly intended to do as much as he did. What has to be proved, therefore, about Parker's consecration is not that ordinarily the co-consecrators are mere witnesses, but that, in spite of their intention to be more, they actually could not. Yet, so far from there being a consensus of theologians in favour of the opinion that the assistant bishops are mere witnesses, the contrary is freely maintained.1 Martène, as is well known, says 'Verum non tantum testes sed etiam cooperatores esse, citra omnem dubitationis aleam asserendum est.' Hallier allows that all may be called 'consecratores'; for the maxim that 'of one sacrament there is but one minister' does not forbid all to act together in modum unius. In any other sense the maxim would not square with the practice of concelebration, which was the rule in ancient times, and is still common in the East. Gasparri, again, holds 'episcopi assistentes sunt probabiliter comministri cum episcopo consecrante' (n. 1088), and adds that if the principal omits to impose his hands, it is agreed in practice that the rite must not be repeated, even sub conditione. dinhon also accepts the three assisting prelates as comministri.3 This is testimony enough. But the theory that the assistant bishops are mere witnesses is inconsistent with the consecration prayer in the Greek rite, which runs: 'Strengthen by the descent and grace of Thine Holy Spirit this one elected and accounted worthy to receive the yoke of the Gospel and the pontifical dignity by the hand of me, a sinner, and of the ministers and fellow-bishops present with me.' It probably is true, as Father S. Smith points out, that the legislation requiring three consecrators was a disciplinary regulation to secure the consent of the province and to guard against schisms.4 But this does not prove that, de facto, only the chief contributes anything. Not only the Eastern Office just quoted, but early Western authorities, indicate the contrary, as Dr. Bright points out;5 and he justly observes that 'the theory which represents the assistant bishops as not really co-operating in the act of consecration is a mere technicalism, the result of Roman centralization.' We conclude, therefore, that if Barlow were incapable of consecrating Parker, this did not affect the validity of his consecration through the other three undisputed bishops.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. De Hierarchia Anglicana, § 4.

Nov. 6, 1805.

Euchologion, Venice, 1869, p. 67. Notes on the Canons, 1882, p. 187. 4 Cf. Reasons, p. 96.

So much for the caveat. We return to the story of Barlow's career just before 1536. Barlow was one of Henry's diplomat ecclesiastics. In 1534-5 he had been on two embassies into Scotland. He was rewarded with the see of St. Asaph, the usual steps of promotion, viz. Congé d'eslire, Election, Royal Assent, and Confirmation (by proxy), but not Consecration, being assignable to their several dates between Jan. 7 and Feb. 23, 1536. But on Jan. 22 he started on a third mission to Scotland, where he remained till a little while before April 25. In a letter of that day his fellow-envoy speaks of him in his absence as 'my lord of St. Davye.' For that see had now become vacant, and to it Barlow was at once translated. He was elected on April 10; the Royal Assent was given on April 20; on the 21st he was confirmed in person at Bow Church. But again there is no record of his consecration. On April 25 he began to adopt the episcopal style as 'W. Meneven.' Next day he received the temporalities of his see accruing ratione vacationis, not by the Writ of Restitution—which is a distinct instrument, and has nothing to do with the intermediate revenues—but by a grant which was of the nature of a grace from the Sovereign, usually provisional and temporary, but in this case absolute and for life. Evidently these were so given him, that he might enjoy them during the rest of his Scotch embassy, the duration of which was as yet uncertain. This was followed (April 27) by the writ of summons to Parliament, addressed to him as 'Meneven,' a summons which he need have been in no hurry to obey; because the Parliament had but just been dissolved, and did not meet again till June 8. His immediate concern was to enter on possession of his see, which he did on May I. A fortnight later (May 13) Barlow was back in Edinburgh, where he remained till 'a daye or twayne' after his colleague left on May 23. Haddan therefore supposes that he started south on May 25, though of course the expression must not be taken too strictly. The herald, who set off as soon as the embassy was over on May 23, arrived in London on June 11, and got a warrant for his 'dyetts' on June 12. It is quite possible that Barlow, though he started after, may have arrived before him. So when Haddan conjectures June 11 as the day of Barlow's consecration, there is no physical impossibility in the way of its having taken place then. If it is urged that, in the writ issued for payment of the herald, and dated June 12, Barlow is described as 'now elect of St. Davyes',' Cromwell, or rather his clerk in the Rolls Court, Chancery Lane, may not

have known what took place at Lambeth only the day before, or would, as likely as not, have drawn out this purely formal warrant for the payment of wages in accordance with what appeared in the herald's papers. At any rate, supposing Barlow was still 'elect' only on June 12, he might, as Estcourt admits (p. 67), have been consecrated on either of the two Sundays (the 18th or 25th) which intervened between his arrival in London and the day on which he took his seat in the House of Lords, June 30. For Convocation was sitting, and there were plenty of bishops in town. And here we touch the main point of proof. It is not from his entry into the House that we are entitled to infer his consecration. For, as Gibson 1 says, a bishop may take his seat as soon as he is confirmed. But granting for the moment the fact of his consecration, the date of it must have fallen between June II and June 30, a conclusion which follows from the precedence that was actually given him when he took his seat. He would take it-by a custom of long standing, soon afterwards embodied in 31 Henry VIII., cap. 10, § 3, of 1539-according to his 'auncientie' or priority of consecration. Now we find him placed below Sampson of Chichester and Repps of Norwich, but above Wharton of St. Asaph, all consecrated prelates. For Sampson was consecrated probably, and Repps certainly, on June 11, but Wharton not till July 2. In this order Barlow's name appears, not only in the lists of the House of Lords and of Convocation, but in other documents where many episcopal signatures appear together, such as the Ten Articles of 1536, the Judgment of the Convocation concerning General Councils of July 20, 1536, and the Bishops' Book of 1537. It is agreed on all hands that, if Barlow was consecrated at all, June 11 or thereabout is the date. But was he consecrated? A bishop enters the House of Lords and takes his precedence 'salvo cuipiam jure.' Barlow did not, by taking his seat last among the bishops, avoid all question, as Estcourt supposes (p. 67), as to the rights of others. For the abbots and priors sat as prelates, though unconsecrated. Twenty-eight had been summoned to this Parliament. As they made no protest against the invasion of their rights when Barlow took his place above them, we may conclude that they took him, as did Wharton when he appeared in the House on July 14, for a consecrated bishop. The only possible way out of the difficulty is to allege certain expressions which Barlow, as well as Henry and Cranmer, were guilty of, in order to prove that they held consecration

<sup>1</sup> Codex, i. 128.

itself cheap, and on the strength of these to maintain that all three not only shuffled out of the ceremony, but actually agreed to a conspiracy of silence, successfully kept it up for the rest of the reign—so successfully, moreover, that, though Barlow was a litigious turncoat, who was always en évidence, and made many enemies, yet his consecration was never suspected by his colleagues in office, if not in order, like Lee, Stokesley, and Gardiner of the Old Learning, nor by his adversaries at law, not even by the prudent Elizabeth and the cautious Parker, till at last it was denounced as a fiasco, forty-eight years after his death, and eighty years after the supposed event, by Champney, the retailer and improver of

the Nag's Head story, in 1616.

But we are now told this is all presumptive evidence, and of no worth, because, on the true principles of historical criticism, 'Factum non præsumitur sed probatur.' S. Smith observes that the 'scepticism' (sc. of Papists) 'about Barlow's consecration is not based on a single omission, but on several omissions' (p. 109); and he then proceeds to enumerate eight 'principal instruments which, according to the practice prevailing in 1536, should have been executed in connexion with an episcopal appointment': (1) The Royal Assent, (2) the Mandate to consecrate, (3) the licence of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, (4) the Record of the Consecration, and (5) the certificate of the same to the Crown; (6) the entry in the Register of the Bishop consecrated, (7) the commission of the Archbishop to a commissary in case he could not consecrate himself, (8) the restitution of temporalities. 'All,' he adds, 'save the Royal Assent are missing, but the absence of two of them can be satisfactorily explained, viz. Nos. (3) and (6), because the books in which they should have been recorded are known to have perished.1 But the list needs further reduction, and then correction: (4) and (5) are but a double entry, made at the same time in the Archbishop's Register, and of (5) there is never any other record than this, the original not being kept. It is absurd to include (7), for there is no reason for thinking that Cranmer did not consecrate Barlow in person. Thus the list of eight is reduced to four: the Royal Assent, the Significavit or Mandate to confirm and consecrate (always in one), the record of consecration with its certificate, and the Restitution of Temporalities. But Father S. Smith has forgotten to include the Congé d'eslire and the Concession of Temporalities, a copy of which Estcourt discovered (cf. p. 72). The documents, therefore,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Smith, p. 115.

Jan.

hat

for

ugh

nce,

ver

like

by

and sco,

the

r of

and ical

her

but

to

to

d in

yal

the

onwn ;

the

he

ties.

the

ould

But (4)

the

ther

surd

mer

ight

lan-

d of

em-

the

y of

ore.

which ought actually to be forthcoming in this case are six. One of them is the entry in Cranmer's Register, which, as everybody knows, is not there. The other five are (a) the Congé d'eslire, (b) the Royal Assent, (c) the Mandate, (d) the Restitution, and (e) the Concession, of Temporalities; and these, as king's writs, should appear in the Record Office, but they are not there. If, as Father S. Smith says, the Congé d'eslire is on the Patent Rolls, it must have been found since Rymer's day. The Royal Assent appears in Cranmer's Register. But it remains that in Rymer's time (c. 1700) none of the five were to be found among the king's writs; for, though he gives the corresponding writs for all other bishops of Barlow's day, he omits all which refer to him. Yet we can prove that every one of them must have existed—(a) because under 25 Henry VIII., c. 20, Barlow could not have been elected without it; (b) and (c) because Cranmer could not have confirmed him without them, and the Assent is referred to in the record of his confirmation in the Archbishop's Register; (d) because it is on record that the vacancy at St. David's terminated on May 1; 1 and (e) we have. Now the Inquisition which determines the fact of this vacancy is an inquiry into temporalities, and the vacancy a vacancy of temporalities. But as this vacancy can only be terminated in one way, by a writ of restitution, Barlow must have had his writ of restitution on May 1. It is true that he would then have had it before his consecration. But this was not uncommon. Bonner had two like writs—one on March 4, 1539, on his promotion to Hereford, and the other on November 18, 1539, when further promoted to London, though he was not consecrated till April 4, 1540.

After all, there is but one material document that, even on the principles of historical criticism directed against us, Anglicans can be required to produce—the Record of Consecration. Cranmer's Register was most carelessly kept. To say that so long as this entry is wanting the suspicion against Barlow's orders will remain, is to set up conditions on which no fact is beyond question and no history worth credit. Is no one to be taken for a Christian who cannot produce his baptismal certificate? It is enough that a man be taken by those who have opportunities of knowing him, whether enemies or friends, for what he gives himself out to be. The presumption is in his favour till he is proved an impostor, and before this could be brought home to Barlow what improbabilities have we not to face? We have to believe that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Estcourt, App. ix.

Henry, though ever professing himself, not for conscientious but for political motives, a Catholic, risked this reputation and all that he hoped to escape or secure by it; that, though a legalist, he consented to the breach of his own laws; that Cranmer, though a craven timeserver, risked the penalties of breaking them; that Barlow, though an unprincipled and selfish man, neglected the one step which could have given him an unimpeachable right to his possessions (for even the Writ of Restitution cannot be sued de jure from the king till after consecration, and is thus no more than a grace when granted before, the grace in this case of a tyrant who, in the notorious instance of Wolsey, had abetted a man in breaking the law and then punished him for breaking it); that under such circumstances Henry, Cranmer, and Barlow would have let their official conduct be completely compromised by the indulgence on one fatal occasion of private opinions, lightly put forth and as lightly signed away, and that no one should ever have heard of it while the men of Henry's generation lived or have dared to protest, even when the tyrant himself was dead! It is not enough to conclude with Estcourt that 'it is a mystery how Barlow can have remained unconsecrated' (p. 81). Any honest man must, with Lingard, go further, and protest that the only reason why we should doubt the consecration of Barlow is that other people whose records of promotion are lost 'did not consecrate Parker, but Barlow did.' 1 'If,' said Archbishop Whately, by way of serious preface to his famous ludicrum opus, 'a man is influenced in one case by objections which in another case he would deride, then he stands convicted of being unfairly biased by his preiudices.'

One other position of historical controversy has to be surveyed before we pass on to the theological field where the main battle now rages. How did Pole treat Edwardine Orders? Here the Bull and the Brief of Paul IV. recently discovered by Dr. Gasquet come into the decision of the question, and give it a temporary interest beyond its intrinsic importance. The facts are briefly given in the *Tablet* (September 21 and October, 1895). At Edward's death on July 6, 1553, out of twenty-six existing sees, three were vacant and two united, so that twenty-two only had incumbents. Of these, counting Barlow as a consecrated bishop, fifteen had been consecrated by the old Pontifical, six by the reformed Ordinals, and one, as it appears, by a mixture of the unreformed and the revised rites. After receiving various

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Birmingham Catholic Magazine, v. 704.

tious

ation

ough

that

es of

and

given

n the

g till

when

n the

king

ınder

have

y the

ghtly lould

ation

mself

that

onse-

l, go

nould

hose

r, but

rious

ed in eride,

pre-

o be

e the

rdine

dis-

ques-

rinsic

ablet

h on

were

cum-

shop,

y the

re of

rious

faculties from Julius III., Pole arrived in London, November 24, 1554, absolved the realm November 30, and then took in hand the work of restitution by issuing his General Dispensation, December 24, and his grant of Faculties to the bishops on January 29, 1555. An embassy started to pay homage to the Pope, in the name of the reconciled nation. They were in Rome from the death of Julius III., during the brief pontificate of Marcellus II., and over the election of Paul IV. At last Paul received their accounts of the change and their homage on June 7, 1555, and immediately sent off the Bull 'Præclara, charissimi,' dealing with the question of Orders, on June 21, following it up by an explanatory Brief, 'Regimini Universalis,' on October 30. It can scarcely be doubted that the Bull and the Brief were drawn up on full information supplied by Thirlby, who was the theologian of the embassy, about all that had taken place at home; while Pole himself had sent full and minute descriptions of the Anglican rites of ordination. Hence the language of the papal documents, though vague in itself, becomes narrowed down in one direction by the circumstances under which they were drawn up. The crucial sentence of the Bull runs as follows:

'Ita tamen ut si qui ad ordines ecclesiasticos tam sacros quam non sacros lab alio quam Episcopo aut Archiepiscopo rite et recte ordinato promoti fuerunt eosdem ordines ab eorum ordinario de novo suscipere teneantur nec interim in eisdem ordinibus ministrent.'

The question immediately arose in England, 'Who were the duly and rightly consecrated bishops in the meaning of the Bull?' and one reason we can see for perplexity in the minds of the Romanensian party lay in such a case as that of Scory. Scory was the only one of the six bishops consecrated by the Edwardine Ordinals who accommodated himself to the new order. He gave up his see and came to live in London under Bonner's jurisdiction, and Bonner, on July 14, 1554, took upon himself to restore 'eundem confratrem nostrum ad publicam Ecclesiæ Ministerii et Officii sui Pastoralis Functionem et Exsecutionem infra Diocesim nostram Londonensem.' He rehabilitated him as a bishop without reconsecration, and so acknowledged the validity of the Edwardine Ordinal.

To obviate such irresponsible breaches of order by 'schismatic' bishops, such as Bonner then was, some clearer speci-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 3 and 4 Ed. VI. c. 12, which provided for the continuation of the Minor Orders, though its provisions were not actually taken advantage of.

fication as to which bishops were 'rite et recte ordinati' and which not, was required. The Brief 'Regimini' was therefore despatched to remove all doubt from the Bull 'Præclara' upon this point. There Paul IV. declares, 'Eos tantum episcopos et archiepiscopos, qui non in forma ecclesiæ ordinati et consecrati fuerunt, rite et recte ordinatos dici non posse.' The Pope is as conciliatory as he knew how to be. He limits his condemnation to those bishops consecrated under the Edwardine Ordinals and such as were ordained by them. But it must be allowed that he did condemn them: for, though he makes no allusion to these formularies, Dr. Gasquet's further discovery of the paper in which Pole sent a description of them to the Pope at this time makes it difficult to suppose that he had anything else in view. Nor, as Canon Moyes observes, would a Pope (and, we may add, least of all such an uncompromising and furious zealot as Caraffa) have shifted the burden of an important decision on to the shoulders of an inferior by using a vague phrase like 'forma Ecclesiæ,' which, if it meant the 'essential form' of ordination, decided nothing. Pole, moreover, was one of the last persons whom Paul IV. would trust; for had he not been suspected of Lutheranism, had he not presided at Trent, had he not taken office under the wife of a Hapsburg-all which things, a Lutheran, a Council, and a Hapsburg, Paul pursued with his boundless capacity for rage and hatred? Paul gave a practical decision. He is not alluding to the 'essential form' of orders, then and now a disputed question throughout Christendom. By the 'forma Ecclesiæ' he meant the old Pontifical, the Forma Ritualis. English Orders bestowed from 1550-3 were invalid because they were bestowed by a new rite. But what of that? Either the Pope meant that any change from the rite in use by the Church is, as such, fatal to valid orders; or else that such changes as were made were equally fatal. It is not the fact of his adverse decision that we care to question, but the theological basis on which it rested. Pole, in his Legatine Constitution of February 10, 1556, followed up the decision of the Pope, and took occasion to justify it doctrinally by embodying 'the pertinent parts of the Instruction of Eugenius IV. to the Armenians. In this, after describing the matter of ordination as the delivery of that by which the order is conferred—the porrectio instrumentorum he adds, "The form of the priesthood is this, Receive the power of offering, &c., and so of the forms of the other orders as they are fully contained in the Roman Pontifical." '2 That

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Tablet, October 5, 1895.

Jan.

and

efore ara'

itum inati

sse.'

mits

the

hem.

for,

Gas-

nt a

icult

non

of all

have

ders

siæ,' ided

hom

d of

aken

rs, a

n his

rac-

sten-

fical,

50-3

But

from

lers;

atal.

Pole,

wed fy it

truc-

de-

t by

m ower

rs as

That

was the guide with him, the Forma Ritualis. He issued merely a practical decision. But in so doing, Pole is merely following Paul, and Paul his predecessor, and Eugenius the Paul and his legate simply condemned the Edwardine Ordinal because they had not anticipated the discoveries of Morinus, and were not a hundred years before their age. Their action is based upon a theological definition as to the essentials of ordination, which dominated Papists and Protestants alike in the sixteenth century, but has since been shown to be unsound. The newly discovered documents, then, have purely an antiquarian interest in the history of the controversy, except in so far as they may have served to establish the present practice of the Roman Church towards Anglican ordinations. The historical question resolves itself into a theological one, and Canon Moyes admits the fairness of this plea.

We turn, then, to the heart of the modern controversy and the theological questions involved. There are three questions which, though largely historical, involve the consideration of theological principles. When the consecration took place (for no one now denies the fact that a ceremony of consecration took place on December 17, 1559) was the intention of the chief consecrator and of the Church adequate? Was the rite a valid one? Have the persons consecrated since been competent subjects for consecration-i.e. Have Anglican Bishops been really Priests? We shall conclude by asking whether the Orders bestowed come up to what is required by the Council of Trent for a valid ordination? And we shall endeavour to answer these questions, as far as possible, from the formularies of our opponents, or from principles admitted by them. The doubt which they profess to feel about our Orders, however, exists only in their own minds. We do not

share it.

The Doctrine of Intention is, within proper limits, a perfectly reasonable one. Men who act in public as the officers of a society must act in all seriousness. They are not children at play, but responsible agents for all the members who severally, and as a body, have an interest in what they do. Much more is this to be required of the officer of a religious society; for any such body, whether a limb of the true Church or not, is at least in earnest. And, as a matter of fact, persons in any such position do, as a rule, mean to do what they have in hand. It is for the objector to prove, if he can, that the officiant did not have such an intention. But nothing less than a positive proof that, on a certain occasion,

the agent in question deliberately made light of what he was doing or intended not to do it, is enough to lay his proceedings open to question. And even then, as in law the presumption is always in favour of an act done, it may be doubted whether the absence of intention to do it, or even the presence of intention not to do it, vitiates the performance

To come, then, to the intention of the minister in the one case in which it is alleged to have been of first importance. Barlow's intention to consecrate Parker was, it is said, defective partly because of his character and partly because of his opinions. Cranmer said he was 'too jocose and apt to bring serious matters to the test of ridicule.' Roger Lewis, LL.B., of St. David's, charged him with having preached there in a sermon of November 1536 to the effect that, 'If the King's Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose and denominate and elect any layman, being learned. to be a bishop, that he, so chosen, without mention of any Orders, should be as good a bishop as he is, or the best in England.' This, by-the-by, is indirect proof that Barlow was consecrated, unless he was foolish enough to hope, as Father S. Smith thinks, that by a double-entendre he could secure the tacit assent of unfriendly hearers without challenging their animosity. But to return. The contention is that by this doctrine Barlow gave evidence of a defective intention on December 17, 1559. For, 'it did not lie on the surface of his mind,' as 'is manifested by the answers he gave in 1540 to the Seventeen Questions on the Sacraments. Barlow and Cranmer declared that no consecration, but only appointment, is necessary.' This citation, which has already done duty before to prove that neither Barlow nor Cranmer would have scrupled to omit the former's consecration in June 1536, is now alleged to prove that Barlow's intention was defective when consecrating Parker in December 1559. Absurd as it is to quote the opinions of a man, like Barlow, belonging to November 1536 and to 1540, to show that he would have had scruples about pocketing them on an occasion in June 1536 before they were uttered, it is still more ridiculous to argue that they must have been there to render his intention open to suspicion on another occasion more than twenty years later. Proof positive must be given that at Parker's consecration Barlow was 'in inward conspiracy with himself' not to consecrate. So long as he himself gave no sign of it, proof cannot be had. The mere fact that he consented to

<sup>1</sup> Reasons, p. 132.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 104.

-

e

e

e

e

-

S

g

a

d

ı,

y

n

W

IS

d

1-

is

1-

ie

re

S.

y

ly

er

1e

e-

d

g

re

1e

to

n

ty

r's

f'

it,

perform the rite must be taken for presumption that he was serious in the doing of it, and that it was not, like the reputed boy-baptism of Athanasius, a 'ludicrum opus.'

This is but common sense: but three theological principles come in to enforce it.

The ministers of the Church are officials, and act as such. Their private opinions do not enter into their acts, and, were they never so ribald, could not stultify them. If they did, Church life and the very conception of an organized society would be impossible. 'Minister sacramenti,' as St. Thomas lays down, 'agit in persona totius Ecclesiæ, cujus est minister: in verbis autem quæ profert, exprimitur intentio Ecclesiæ, quæ sufficit ad perfectionem sacramenti, nisi contrarium exterius exprimatur ex parte ministri, vel recipientis sacramentum.'

In the time of St. Augustine it was already established that the efficacy of the Sacraments does not depend either on the moral or on the intellectual disposition of the minister. It is not a question either of Barlow's character or of his opinions. And this well-known rule rests upon a simple but solemn principle: agent and instrument are but channels. The grace is not theirs, but God's. It was precisely on this principle that the Synod of Arles in 314 decided that if a traditor bishop had ordained clergy, 'non illis obsit ordinatio' (c. 13). The same synod (c. 8) only rejected such heretical baptism as had not been administered in the name of the Trinity—i.e. such as was deficient in its 'form'; and this rule was adopted by the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa (c. 13). It only remained for the great Western doctor to reaffirm it in an endless variety of statement against the Donatists, whose root contention was that the unworthiness of the minister hinders the effect of the Sacraments. matters not whether the unworthiness be, as with those who were the marks of Donatist rage, a moral act of cowardice under persecution, or, as in this matter of defective intention, a lack of intelligence or will. The principle is the same. In answer to the question whether we ought to take into account the mind of the minister, St. Augustine says No; for 'sæpe mihi ignota est humana conscientia, sed certus sum de Christi misericordia.' 2 And the reason of this, he would say, is that the Sacraments are just 'gifts of God.' They keep their Divine character even among heretics, for they are

<sup>1</sup> Summa, III. iv. 8 ad 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Contra Litt. Pet. i. §§ 7, 8.

tic

m

he

th

mi

ac

25

wa

Ba

the

an

If.

lo

of

CI

A

tic

ch

tic

ca

ac

Cl

tri

fo

th

of

be

tic

WI

CO

to

Cre

CO

O

int of

ot

not in their possession, but in God's: 'Mali ergo ac facinorosi, carnales, animales, diabolici à seductoribus suis sibi dari arbitrantur quæ non nisi munera Dei sunt sive sacramenta sive spiritales aliquas operationes circa præsentem salutem.'

But an appeal to the teaching of the undivided Church, though enough for Anglicans, must, if it is to satisfy Roman controversialists, find an echo in the utterances of their own theologians. The 'living Church,' as they would say, has perpetually to reinforce the principles of the ancient Church if they are to escape the suspicion of having become obsolete. Bellarmine then lays down—

'Non est opus intendere quod facit Ecclesia Romana; sed quod facit vera Ecclesia, quæcunque illa sit, vel quod Christus instituit, vel quod faciunt Christiani: ista enim in idem recidunt. Petes: Quid si quis intendat facere, quod facit ecclesia particularis et falsa, quam ipse putat veram, ut Genevensis, et intendat non facere quod facit Ecclesia Romana? Respondeo, etiam id sufficere.' 2

He need not, then, intend to do what the Roman Church does, but only have a general 'intentio faciendi quod facit Ecclesia.' Further, he need not intend the effect of the sacrament; that will follow from the sacrament, independently of what he may think, so the Roman Catholic professor, Rev. J. Crowe, puts it (p. 13). De Lugo and Franzelin suffice for his authorities, though he says it would be easy to add to them.

Licet enim v.g.,' says Franzelin, 'baptizans nec Christum nec sanctitatem aut efficaciam sacramenti nec veritatem Ecclesiæ et religionis Christianæ credat, dummodo sciat eum ritum credi et usurpari a Christianis ut sacrum, potest habere, et si a Christiano rogatus baptizet, ordinarie habebit intentionem faciendi ritum, non sua quidem sed ex Christianorum opinione sacrum: qua intentione supposita (sive actuali sive virtuali, sive reflexa sive exercita) jam non suo nomine agit, sed se exhibet ministrum ecclesiæ, et proinde implicite ministrum Christi principalis agentis . . . et generatim, ubi dubium incideret de valore sacramentorum, non de occulta intentione sed de servata manifesta materia et forma quæri soleret.' 3

Father S. Smith tries to discount the advantage Anglicans derive from the application of this doctrine of Intention to Barlow by asserting that this kind of intention is only 'sufficient when the rite administered is the rite of the Catholic Church.' But the writers make no such limitation, and such an objection is an objection to the rite and not to the inten-

<sup>1</sup> De Bapt. iv. § 27; cf. Ep. 89, ad Festum.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Disp. de Controversiis, De Sacr. in gen. i. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Tract. De Sacr. in gen., Thesis xvi. p. 208.

<sup>4</sup> Reasons, p. 143.

i,

e

h,

n

n

S

:h

)-

bd

it,

a,

bd

es,

a.

at

ly

ts

es,

ti-

nis

a

et,

ali

ed

sti

ore

sta

ns

to

fi-

lic

ch

n-

tion, which, if it is simply to act seriously, and as Christ's minister, is as possible to a heretic as to a Catholic. Father Crowe concludes without any such evasive qualifications, for he is not writing up 'Reasons for rejecting Anglican Orders':

'It appears to me, then, that no false doctrine of Barlow dislodged this one dominant idea from his mind—viz. that he was acting as a minister of Christ. It may not have been there expressly; but, according to the doctrine laid down, it was there implicitly, inasmuch as all the circumstances of the case lead us to infer that the ceremony was regarded as a sacred one by the then Anglican Church; and Barlow, being invited to be the consecrating prelate, went through the ceremony. He conformed his will to that of the Anglican Church: it considered the function a religious and Christian one; and so, implicitly, Barlow acted as a minister of Christ' (p. 16).

If, then, that is all which can be required by Roman theologians, and all, too, which, remembering that ministers are officers, and that the efficacy of the Sacraments rests on Christ as the 'Principalis Agens,' ought to be required, clearly Anglican Orders are in no way invalidated by Barlow's intention. Jocose as he may have been at other times, no one has charged him with not being in earnest at Parker's consecration. His 'Intentio externa,' then, is all right; but, unless it can be proved that on that particular occasion, by an express act of will, he dissociated himself from the 'Principalis Agens,' and said to himself, 'I do not intend to act as a minister of Christ,' his 'Intentio interna' is beyond question too.

But, it will be said, the intention of the minister is a trifling matter as compared with the intention of the Church for which he acts. True; but the English Church, under Edward VI., intended, without any reservation, to 'continue' the episcopal succession and the ancient threefold ministry of the Church as she found it.<sup>1</sup>

Here for a moment we must diverge. Attempts have been made to cast suspicion on her mind by drawing attention to the statute 13 Eliz. c. 12 (1571), the cases of Cartwright, Travers, Morrison, and Whittingham, &c., and some comments of Macaulay; so the Dutch pastors, in their reply to Bishop Wordsworth's Responsio (cf. pp. 31 sqq.), try to create a presumption against the intention of the Church to continue the ancient ministry by her alleged indifference to Orders in the cases above. But the statute is of doubtful interpretation: and the Dutch themselves admit that the case of Morrison stands alone, but for Macaulay's assertion of others (p. 39). Referring to the case of Morrison, he writes:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. Preface to the Ordinal.

'An instrument is still extant by which the Primate of all England in the year 1582 authorized a Scotch minister, ordained according to the laudable forms of the Scotch Church, to preach and administer the Sacraments in any part of the province of Canterbury. In the year 1603 Convocation solemnly recognized a church in which episcopal control and episcopal ordination were then unknown as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ' (c. 55); and then, in a note, 'It was by the Act of Uniformity, passed after the Restoration, that persons not episcopally ordained were for the first time made incapable of holding benefices.' 1

Foreigners may claim some indulgence for gravely quoting Macaulay as an authority on English Church history; but the Dutch might have noticed that Mr. Firminger, whom at this point they quote with approbation, makes it clear (cf. pp. 12, 13) that the Act of Uniformity merely gave legal force to ecclesiastical enactments of 1576, 1584, 1597, and 1603 (c. 39); that canon 55 of 1603 was drawn up in view of 'a full determination to restore a regularly constituted episcopacy,' 2 and therefore in no sense commits the English Church to a recognition of the Kirk; and that Morrison's case testifies to no more than the well-known slackness of Grindal in enforcing the law. But the law, as it then stood, left a loophole, it is urged, for the admission of men in Presbyterian orders to minister in the English Church, because it (13 Eliz. c. 12) required subscription to 'all the articles of religion which only concern the profession of the true faith.' Had the interpretation of the statute been supported by more cases than that of Morrison, some amount of attention would be due to it. But all the judges of the realm decided against the restrictive use of the word 'only,' and took it as applying descriptively to the whole thirty-nine; while Convocation, acting on the same principle, required subscription to all. Add to this that Cartwright sought in vain to shelter himself under the supposed meaning of the Act: that Travers's claim to be a lawful minister was rejected by Whitgift in 1584; and that the Archbishop remarked, 'If Mr. Whittingham had lived [sc. to see the decision of his case] he had been deprived'; and it is clear that the habitual practice of the Church of England has been to disallow any but episcopally bestowed Orders. She has uniformly acted upon the principles laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal; and the attempt to prove the contrary can scarcely be taken seriously. But if the contrary were true, and these alleged

who valid

or a

189

'It is anci Ordo Deacont Eng Bish calle follo

calle cam time bold on Edw actie whice be o

of A gove temp Deni nor writing their history which

scruj beco pugn

<sup>1</sup> History, i. 38.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Harington, ap. Harold Browne's Articles, p. 559 n.

lli.

nd

to

er

he

ch

a

in a-

ne

ng ut at

cf.

ral nd

W

ed

sh

n's

of

od.

in

ch.

he

he

ip-

of

lm

nd

red

in

the

ted

· If

se

ual

ny

ted

al;

cen

ged

irregularities of Elizabeth's hierarchy were admitted, how could that touch the question of the Intention of the Church when the Ordinal was drawn up in 1550? It is about as valid to argue that the laxity of the Elizabethan hierarchy vitiated the intention with which the Church accepted the Ordinal eight years before her accession as to pretend that Barlow's intention in 1559 was vitiated by the lax opinions which he may have held twenty years before—about as valid, or about as absurd.

We come back, then, to the Preface to the Ordinal. In 1552 it ran:

'It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. . . And, therefore, to the intent these Orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, or Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following.'

The Church intended to maintain what has since been called the Apostolic Succession; for, though the actual term came into use later, the recognition of the thing itself at this time admits of no doubt. Nothing, indeed, stands out more boldly than the tenacity with which, amidst all the confusion on doctrinal issues which characterised the reign of Edward VI., Cranmer and his fellows clung in their official action to the continuance of the ministry in the form in which they had immemorially received it. And how could it be otherwise?

'Up to the period of the Reformation,' says Bishop Stubbs (p. 50), 'there was no other idea of Episcopacy except that of transmission of Apostolic Commission; that the ministry of the Episcopal government could be introduced without such a link was never contemplated until Bugenhagen reconstituted a nominal Episcopate in Denmark, and this was an example not likely to be taken in England, nor was it so accepted. There is then no occasion to test the writings of the Elizabethan divines in search of traces of a belief in their own official existence. Archbishop Parker's own work on the history of the Church of England suffices to prove the importance which he attached to succession.'

If you ask for a theory of the succession, the fact of its scrupulous preservation involves one; but for theories to become explicit the acts which carry them must first be impugned. No sooner, then, was the Presbyterian platform

the

pri

Ar

ind

sel

de

pri

at

Ch

Lo

car

tha

COI

of

mı

Cr

to

Ki

ap

tha

pre

off

sta

(1:

wit

be

the

rev

Cr

Go

ins

the

fro

sec

the

tin

Ca

bu

no

ma

bis

the

the

preached up by Cartwright and his followers as the only form of church government jure divino, than a catena of writers appears which reaches its height at Bancroft's sermon in 1589. Then the Episcopal theory which had slowly developed under opposition stands out in distinct maturity, but not till then. Cranmer was a practical reformer. As such, he in no sense felt himself called upon to defend his actions where they proceeded on principles that had never been questioned. Theories belong to the age that followed, the age of the controversialist and apologist. The language of the Preface to the Ordinal implicitly contains a doctrine, but it asserts no more than intention as to a course of action to maintain the Episcopal succession in fact.

Its critics, however, are scarcely consistent in the further charge they bring against it. By some we are told that its language is so ambiguous as to be consistent with the intention to set up a merely official or decorative hierarchy; by others, that no other theory of the Christian Ministry is to be seen there but that anti-sacerdotal and anti-supernatural conception of it which belongs to Dissenting Clericalism. If you must see one theory and one alone in a document, that document can scarcely be called ambiguous. But the preface is ambiguous, so we are assured, because it must be interpreted—on the legal maxims which apply to the interpretation of any document-by the mind of the legislator, Ordinal is unintelligible unless you read into it the private opinions of its framers, and in particular of Cranmer; and the desired manipulation is effected by an elaborate comparison of its text with the writings of the more prominent reformers. In fact, the ultra-Protestant interpretation of the events of the English Reformation is thrust upon us as the only historical one. Both Canon Moyes 1 and Father S. Smith 2 spend much labour on this contention. But we strenuously repudiate the confusion between the intention of the Church and the private opinions of the revisers of her rites. They are not ad rem. The documents of a society must be taken as they stand—to mean what they say, neither more nor less. If interpretation be wanted, it must be found in the official action or other official documents of the body in question; and, if it be a living body, occasion may arise to force a decision from its living voice. For, if otherwise, if the opinions of individuals, be they never so representative, must be taken to force its meaning, the existence of a society is imperilled. Its members have no liberty, and its action no principle of cohesion. If

<sup>1</sup> Tablet, Feb. 9 to March 30.

<sup>2</sup> Reasons, p. 84.

Jan.

nly

of

non

eve-

but

uch,

ions

een

the

e of

but

n to

ther

t its

ten-

; by

o be

con-

you

that

face

iter-

tion

The

vate

the

ison

ners.

f the

rical

nuch

the

vate

rem.

-to

ation

other

be a

n its

uals.

e its

bers

. If

the Church is held to be committed to all or any of Cranmer's private opinions, as such, the Church principle breaks down. And the reformers themselves seem to recognize this. An individual reformer will often fail to be consistent with himself, and in general they are conscious of a clear line of demarcation between their 'temerarious definitions' and the principles which underlay their official action. Thus Ridley at times maintains the Real Presence. 'The true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper, but yet sacramentally and spiritually, not carnally or corporally giving life, and in that respect really, that is, according to His Benediction, giving life, 1-a clear confession that Christ is present in the sacrament as a result of consecration and not simply in us as a consequence of communion. So there is an equally marked contrast between Cranmer's language about Orders in 1540,2 and the doctrine to which he appended his official consent in the Bishop's or the King's Books of 1537 and 1543.3 When he told Henry that appointment without consecration was sufficient, he declared that, though his replies were 'his opinion and sentence at this present' he did 'not temerariously define.' He acted on his official sentiments when he declined to depart from the statutory requirements for consecration in Hooper's case (1551), and it looks as if since 1548 these had been identical with his genuine convictions. For if private opinions are to be admitted at all, none can have so decisive a bearing on the meaning of the Ordinal as those which he put forth when revision was all but actually in hand. In August 1548 Cranmer wrote in his Catechism: 'The ministration of God's Word, which Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself did first institute, was derived from the Apostles unto others after them by the imposition of hands, and giving the Holy Ghost from the Apostles' time to our days. And this was the consecration orders and unction of the Apostles whereby they at the beginning made bishops and priests, and this shall continue in the Church even to the world's end.' Certainly this Catechism was largely the work of the Lutheran Justus Jonas, but that does not touch the question whether it is true or not. Cranmer, moreover, departed from his original by making both the Apostolic Succession and the necessity of bishops more explicit than the Latin; while, in asserting that the ministry is propagated by an external rite which conveys the Holy Ghost, Cranmer makes Orders a sacrament. Had

3 Cf. Formularies of Faith, pp. 103 and 277.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Works, P. S. p. 236. <sup>2</sup> Collier, ix. 208.

no

pa

mi

Fo

rec

rel

bo

ou

gr

0

CI

St

et

ag

CT

T

we space, we might compare the Archbishop's language in the Reformatio Legum of 1551 (cc. 12 and 16), where, in legislating for the Church, he contemplates the continuance of the episcopal office and nothing less—a fact the more remarkable considering the low sacramental tone of that 'laborious fiasco.' Thus, at the only critical period when the intention of the Church could be supposed to suffer at all from identification with the mind of the revisers of her Ordinal, nothing is clearer than that she was committed to no more than she has formally accepted from them in the way of change.

But we deprecate entirely the possibility of any such taint, supposing that it were found to be the uniform mark of their writings at the time.

The Church herself has repudiated this method of interpretation. For in 1559 the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. c. 1) sets up as the standard by which heresy, and so by implication the Church's doctrine and the meaning of her formularies, is to be ascertained, the Canonical Scriptures, the first four General Councils, and whatever Parliament and Convocation together might decree. In 1571 Convocation, acting within the limits here laid down for it, decreed 'the golden rule of the Church of England, "In primis, videbunt Concionatores ne quid unquam doceant pro concione quod a populo religioso teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti quodque ex illa ipsa Catholici Patres et veteres Episcopi collegerunt."' The appeal of the Church, as of her great theologians like Hooker, is uniformly not to the Reformers, but to the Catholic Standards of Belief.

The Church intends to do what Our Lord did, to confer the Orders which He instituted. At a time when ordinations, as well as the other ministrations of the Church, were overlaid with a doctrinal and ceremonial system which challenged opposition when set side by side with the Scriptures, she accepted a revision of her Ordinal at Cranmer's hands which, hazardous if it was to set aside usages of respectable antiquity, escaped all serious danger by uniform reference to Scriptural precedent. It reduced the multiplied observances for the ordination of priests to a combination of our Lord's own formulæ of giving the priestly commission to the Apostles,<sup>2</sup> and similarly the disjointed and excessive forms for the consecration of a bishop to the 'Accipe,' 3 and the words of St. Paul to the Bishop Timothy.4

<sup>1</sup> Cardwell's Synodalia, i. 126; cf. Conc. in Trullo, c. 19.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. St. John xx. 23; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; St. Matthew xxviii. 18, 19. <sup>3</sup> St. John xx. 23. <sup>4</sup> 2 Tim. i. 6, 7.

Jan.

the

ing

pi-

ble

ous

ion

ifi-

ing

she

ıch

cof

er-

1)

ion

, is

our

ion

nin

of

res

næ lici

the

aly ief.

fer

ns,

red

he

ch, ty,

ral

he

wn

es,2

he

of

The Church again is entitled to the same plea with regard to intention as any individual minister. The efficacy of the Sacraments depends on the fact that they are Christ's. It is no more affected by any misconception of their nature on the part of a particular church than on the part of a particular minister, provided the essential matter and form are kept. For the valid intention of a particular church, no more can be required than the purpose to do what our Lord did; for a particular church stands to the universal Church in the same relation as a particular minister to his own communion. In both alike, any defect is covered by the general principle that, given the simple desire to conform in a general way to our Lord's purpose, He holds all responsibility for His own grace and shares it neither with this church nor that minister. On no other principle would it be possible for the Roman Church herself to feel assured of her own succession. She owns as much, and throws the burden on her Lord. So does St. Augustine: 'Sacramenta eadem sunt, ubique integra sunt, etiam si prave intelligantur ac discordiose tractantur,' 1 and again, 'Baptismum Christi, id est verbis evangelicis consecratum, ubique eumdem esse nec hominum quorumlibet ac quâlibet perversitate violari.' So may we.

# ART. II.—CANON GORE ON THE INCARNATION AND THE EUCHARIST.

Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation. By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Canon of Westminster, of the Community of the Resurrection, Radley. (London, 1895.)

THE preface of the Bampton Lectures for the Year 1891 contained a statement that the lecturer hoped to

'have the opportunity of preparing another volume, which shall appeal to a more strictly theological public, and deal with some subjects which are necessarily alluded to rather than discussed in these pages, such, for example, as—

'(1) The conception entertained in early Greek theology of the supernatural in its relation to nature. . . .

'(2) The relation of Ebionism and Gnosticism to the theology of the New Testament and of the second century. . . .

'(3) The conception of the Incarnation at different periods, patristic, early mediæval, later scholastic.' <sup>3</sup>

1 De Bapt. iii. 15. 2 De Bapt. vi. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God, preface, pp. vii, viii.

lea

Et

the

he

oth

su

car

rel

da

Fa

the

SOI

the

ne

pa

ha

WE

in

In

kn

po

lec

we

up

Wa

fri

for

as

att

ce

ter

SO

su

Ch

The present volume of Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation is, to a certain extent, a fulfilment of these anticipations. It does not, indeed, contain any direct discussion of early Greek Christian thought on 'the supernatural in its relation to nature,' or of 'the relation of Ebionism and Gnosticism to the theology of the New Testament and of the second century.' But there is a 'prolonged treatment of the theology of the New Testament and the Church on '(pref. p. vii) the subject of 'the consciousness of our Lord in His mortal life'; and it is not inappropriate that the distinguished author should have written on 'the Virgin Birth of our Lord' and 'Transubstantiation and Nihilianism' in connexion with this Dissertation.

The interval which has elapsed since the publication of the *Bampton Lectures* may be held to be sufficient indication that these *Dissertations* represent Canon Gore's deliberate thought, and that all due pains have been taken to make the language accurately express his real meaning.

I. The treatment of the subject of our Lord's knowledge in the Bampton Lectures had the unsatisfactory feature that, on one point, it was not possible to be sure of the lecturer's meaning. It was clear that he demanded, in somewhat imperative terms, the existence of much ignorance in the mind of our Lord, and regarded this ignorance as connected with the condescension of the Eternal Word. But as to whether our Lord in His Divine Being, as well as in His Humanity, was without complete knowledge, there were statements which did not appear to be altogether consistent with one another. There were, on the one hand, some passages which seemed to necessitate an opinion that the Eternal Word stripped Himself in the Incarnation of His perfect knowledge. 'He abjured,' it was said, 'the prerogatives of equality with God'; 'He abandoned certain prerogatives of the Divine mode of existence in order to assume the human'; the 'act' 'on the part of the Son' in the Incarnation was regarded 'as an abandoning of what He possessed,' so that 'for our sakes the Son of God abandoned His own prerogatives in God'; and it was added in a note:

'It is not enough to recognize that our Lord was ignorant of a Divine secret, in respect of His human nature, unless we recognize also that He was so truly acting under conditions of human nature as Himself to be ignorant. "The Son" did not know.'

A reasonable interpretation of these statements seemed to

<sup>1</sup> Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God, pp. 157-9, 266.

an.

ted of

ect

er-

sm

nd

ent

n'

ord

is-

th

in

of

on

he

ge

at,

n-

he

ed

to

[is

re

nt

ne he

lis

a-

one

n-

Ie

ed

a

ze

re

to

lead to the opinion that the Bampton Lecturer regarded the Eternal Word as having Himself in His Divine Nature, in the Incarnation, ceased to possess certain attributes of Godhead, and among them the attribute of omniscience. On the other hand, there were phrases which did not altogether support this opinion. The statement that, 'in becoming Incarnate, the Son of God retained and expressed His essential relation to the Father,' and 'received,' 'as eternally so in the days of His flesh, the consciousness of His own and of His Father's Being, and the power to reveal that which He knew; the evidently deliberate emphasis on the 'unchanged Personality' and 'continuous consciousness' of the Word; and the assertion that, 'as being God in manhood, He possessed 1 at every moment the Divine, as well as the human, consciousness and nature,' 2 showed thoughtful readers the necessity of pausing before ascribing to the lecturer the opinion which we have mentioned.

When we had occasion to review the Bampton Lectures<sup>3</sup> we deemed it fairer to their author, since we were promised in the preface a fuller and more scientific treatment of the Incarnation, while writing at some length on the human knowledge of our Lord, to leave this still more important point untouched. We could not feel sufficiently sure of the lecturer's meaning to justify us in assuming that he held as we were disposed to think.

A different attitude from the silence which we imposed upon ourselves in view of the anticipated additional volume was taken by the Bishop of Bombay. In an article of great friendliness, published in the *Indian Church Quarterly Review* for October 1892, he pointedly called attention to the apparent assertions that the Son of God ceased to possess some of the attributes of Godhead, and appealed to the lecturer to remove certain sentences from subsequent editions of his work. The appeal did not meet with the hoped-for response. The sentences in question remain in the copies which are now being sold, and, so far as we are aware, no explanation of the suspected passages was given by the lecturer.

The recently published Dissertations have removed our

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The italics are not ours.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God, pp. 156-8, 265-6.

<sup>3</sup> Church Quarterly Review, January 1892. See also January 1893,

p. 549.
4 On Some Points in Mr. Gore's "Bampton Lectures," Indian Church Quarterly Review, October 1892, especially pp. 488-92. Compare with this article the Bishop of Bombay's 1893 Charge, Churchmen and the Higher Criticism.

th

pa

CC

th

ev

as

se

ab

th

sti

an

tru

rea

sic

an

In

an lat

ces

an

011

en

of

mo

the

de

Sai

lim

got

syr

mu

der

apa

Bu

pos

pp.

uncertainty about Canon Gore's position. It is no longer possible to hope that the benignior interpretatio of the Bampton Lectures can be maintained. There is, indeed, ground for satisfaction that he should continue to express his belief in the infallibility and impeccability of our Lord (p. 80), and that he should repudiate the theory according to which the Eternal Word, during the time of His mortal life as Man. abandoned His work in the inner Being of the Holy Trinity and His functions in the universe (pp. 91-3, 105, 206). But there are abundant signs that his view of the Incarnation requires the abandonment of Divine attributes by the Eternal Word Himself. The phrases to which exception was taken when they were used in the Bampton Lectures are retained, frequently repeated, and given additional emphasis. He claims the rejection of the denial that our Lord could 'be personally in any perplexity (p. 95); he refuses to be contented with a view which simply puts in juxtaposition, during our Lord's earthly life, the Divine and human consciousness'; it was 'the Son Himself, as He reveals Himself to men in manhood,' Who 'did not know' (p. 97); there was 'a real abandonment, on the part of the Eternal Son in becoming Incarnate, of Divine prerogatives inconsistent with a proper human experience'; the Incarnation involved 'a real self-impoverishment, a real self-emptying, a real self-limitation on the part of the Eternal Word of God' (p. 204), and meant 'a real abandonment of Divine prerogative and attributes by the Eternal Son within a certain sphere '(p. 206). Moreover, if this language was ambiguous, the method of the argument would make the writer's meaning clear. The distinction between the abandonment of Divine attributes by the Word within the sphere of the Incarnation and His continued possession of them in the inner life of the Holy Trinity and in His cosmic functions shows that it is the actual surrender of what is Divine by the Divine Son Himself which is advocated. The repudiation of the Fathers who allowed a limited human knowledge, as well as of those who denied it, would not be required except on this view. The rejection of the 'metaphysical' immutability of God would not otherwise be to the point. And it is worth while to notice that the word 'potentially' is now introduced into the statement that, 'as God He possessed potentially, at every moment, the Divine as well as the human consciousness and nature' (p. 97),2 and

1 The italics are our own.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The word 'potentially' obviously must refer to the possession of the 'Divine consciousness.' This harmonizes with the rest of the book.

an.

rer

he

ief

nd

he

an, itv

But

ion

nal

cen

ed.

He

be

on-

ing

us-

to

'a

m-

a

real

ita-

and

tri-

06).

the

dis-

the

ued

and

vo-

ited

ould

the

e be

ord

'as

vine and

n of

that English divines who spoke of a human ignorance on the part of Christ are regarded as failing to be of service for the purposes of the writer's discussion (p. 198).

For this view of the Incarnation, then, the claim is made that it is necessitated by Holy Scripture, that it does not contravene any formal decision of the Catholic Church, and that it is consonant with reason. And a 'fourfold appeal' is made to opponents of the position:

'1. That they will seriously attempt to grapple with the positive evidence for it as a whole and in its continuity. This, as far as I can ascertain, they have hitherto left undone, and have contented themselves with dealing with this or that disconnected "text," or with abstract argument and appeals to consequences.

'2. That they will (so far as they are Anglicans) bear in mind that the whole historical position and justification of that specific form of Christianity called Anglicanism is bound up with its strenuous appeal to Scripture. In that appeal we must be sincere

and thorough.

'3. That they will not forget that, so far as scientific theology has in and for this age a special intellectual responsibility, it is to be true to facts. Theology—Christian theology—may be said to be as really inductive as physical science: that is to say, it draws conclusions from facts of revelation. These facts are utterances of prophets and inspired men, but most of all the deeds and words of the Incarnate Son. As truly as the facts of physical nature both justify and limit the conclusions of physical science, do these facts of revelation justify and limit the conclusions of theology; and where the facts cease to support theory, theory is, in theology as elsewhere, groundless and misleading.

'4. The real recognition of the suggestions of Scripture about our Lord's human state will give to the Church's teaching a great enrichment. There is no doubt, I think, that the general teaching of the Catholic Church for many centuries about our Lord has removed Him very far from human sympathies, very much further from the Christ of the New Testament. The minimizing of the meaning of His Manhood is (among other things) largely accountable for the development of an exaggerated devotion to His Mother and the Saints. In proportion as the real human experiences, sufferings, and limitations of Christ during the period of His humiliation are forgotten and ignored, in that proportion men will go to seek human sympathy from on high in some other quasi-deified being. We must recover the strength which the Christian Creed is meant to derive from a Christ made in all points like unto His brethren, apart from sin' (pp. 205-6).

But what does Canon Gore mean by speaking of our Lord 'potentially' possessing the 'Divine Nature'? The same sentence, as already quoted, without the word 'potentially,' was used in the Bampton Lectures, pp. 265-6.

wi

ho

th

by

G

ev

ig

th

G

it

in

H

or

se

th

D

Wi

th

re

no

of

ma

or

the

Ap

by

log

M

xii

pr

the

we

sp

no

as

E<sub>1</sub>

Such an appeal necessarily claims the most serious attention of any whose duty it is to form an opinion on the value of Canon Gore's position. It will be observed that in it he asks that the 'positive evidence' in support of his theory may be considered 'as a whole and in its continuity.' We shall, we think, be right in understanding him to mean by this 'positive evidence' that which, as he contends, is contained in Holy Scripture.¹ That it does not include more appears to be shown by the facts that he does not claim any support from Christian tradition, and that the use he makes of reason only requires that the theory be compatible with it, not that it is necessitated by it.

It may be within the recollection of some of our readers that in our review of the Bampton Lectures for 1891 2 we discussed at considerable length the various passages in the New Testament which we thought important in connexion with the knowledge of our Lord. Our conclusion was that a fair estimate of all these passages failed to necessitate, or to lead in the direction of, an assertion of the existence of ignorance even in the Humanity of Christ. We do not intend to repeat this discussion after so short an interval; but we think it of primary importance to point out that, even if our treatment of these passages was vitiated, as we presume Canon Gore would say that it was vitiated, by our contenting ourselves 'with dealing with this or that disconnected "text," and even if the interpretations we adopted were due to an improper degree of attention to 'abstract argument and appeals to consequences,' it would still be the case that the evidence we were then considering would afford no sufficient support to Canon Gore's view. We do not for a moment admit that the line of interpretation which we then urged was faulty; it will bear, we think, close scrutiny in the way of critical study of Holy Scripture, as well as in comparison with patristic comment. But the present question is not the knowledge of our Lord as Man, but His knowledge as the Eternal Son of God 'within the sphere of the Incarnation.' Let us suppose that in the passages in Holy Scripture to which we formerly referred a different interpretation from that we then adopted should be received; let us grant, for the sake of argument, that there may have been indications of ignorance when our Lord marvelled, or asked questions, or prayed, or called upon the Father in the Agony and the Fourth Word from the Cross, when it is said of Him that He 'advanced in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Compare p. 203.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Church Quarterly Review, January 1892, pp. 297-303.

n.

1-

ie

ie

y

11.

is

ed

to

rt

on

at

rs

S-

he

on

a

to

of

ot

il;

en ne

ng

an

nd

he

ent

ent

red

ay

son

the

the

on.

to hat

ake

nce

, or

ord l in

wisdom,' and when He spoke the words 'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' Such a position has been taken up by some who are very far indeed from agreeing with Canon There have not been wanting those who have been even eager to assert that these parts of the Gospels indicate ignorance, while they have been careful to limit the ignorance to the human mind of Christ, and to expressly repudiate any theory of abandonment of Divine attributes by the Word of God. In the judgment of not a few distinguished theologians it was possible for the humanity of our Lord to be at times in ignorance, not because the Divine Person had abandoned His knowledge, but because He restrained it so that it did not on those occasions pass into His human mind.1 For ourselves, we indeed see strong reasons for holding to the belief that the human mind of Christ received more fully from His Divine knowledge than many who take this view would be willing to allow; but the attitude to which we have referred is of singular importance in the present question, as showing that, even if the Scriptural passages on which Canon Gore relies do indicate ignorance, it is an ignorance which there is no reason for attributing to the Divine Person of the Word.2

¹ See, e.g., Bright, The Incarnation as a Motive Power, edition 2, pp. 290-300; Morality in Doctrine, pp. 332-5; Waymarks in Church History, pp. 390-3. Canon Gore (pp. 200-1) appears to regard a portion of the passage in the last of these references as to some extent approximating to his own view. Very careful consideration of it convinces us that when Dr. Bright says 'He willed to think and feel humanly through organs of thought and feeling which, being human, were limited,' he means that the Word condescended to be limited in knowledge within the sphere of the Incarnation quâ Man only. This is shown by the whole Appendix of which the passage in question forms part, and especially by the sentence which immediately follows: 'If we take ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε in logical connexion with what precedes and follows, we shall see that practically it means "He became inferior to the Father as touching His Manhood."

<sup>2</sup> Canon Gore apparently would say that 'the Son' in St. Mark xiii. 32 must mean the Divine Person of the Son, and cannot be interpreted to mean the Son in His human mind (see p. 97: 'The Son Himself... did not know'), and that this passage so taken must coloun the rest. If the Son must mean the Divine Person of the Son, there would be no reason for limiting the meaning to the Son 'within the sphere of the Incarnation,' and on Canon Gore's view of the passage we should be led further to the view which he repudiates on p. 84, note <sup>1</sup>. It seems to us most in harmony with Holy Scripture, taken as a whole, to understand this passage as meaning that the knowledge of the Son is derived from that of the Father (see St. Basil, Ep. 236); but, as an alternative interpretation, both the immediate context and the general teaching of the New Testament would point to a far higher probability that the meaning is that on this matter

The truth is that it is not the 'positive evidence' from Holy Scripture at all, but an arbitrary impatience of leaving unexplained a 'juxtaposition' of what is Divine and what is human, that is to be observed as the cause of the theory which the Dissertations defend.\(^1\)

We are not conscious that we look at the evidence from the New Testament as a series of 'disconnected' texts. Rather to us these texts are parts of the great picture of the Christ of the Gospels, of a general presentation of our Divine Teacher as one who, though He is Man, yet possesses omniscience and at times makes use of it. To read through St. John's Gospel and to consider it 'as a whole' is, to us, to have before our minds the figure of One who, as He teaches, possesses in its fulness the truth of God. Even as He prays, He holds in His consciousness the most intimate knowledge of the relations within the eternal Godhead, and of the destinies of His Church. And here, as in so many matters, St. John completes what the Synoptists show. They, too, in our judgment, considered 'as a whole,' present the Christ as One who teaches out of a fulness of knowledge that is Divine; and if anywhere, as Man, He speaks in ignorance-an opinion which, we repeat, has to us less probability as the outcome of the Gospel history than the belief in the completeness of the knowledge even of His human mind-it is far more in harmony with the general picture to regard the ignorance as due to the Divine Person restraining His Divine knowledge from flooding His human mind, or abstaining from translating it into the mode of knowledge which a human mind can grasp, than to suppose that the ignorance appertained to the Divine Person Himself. It is not those who agree with us who are open to the charge of arguing from 'disconnected'

We should disagree in toto on this point with Canon Gore if we were to look at the New Testament alone. Further, we demur altogether to the principle of isolating the interpretation of Holy Scripture from the general teaching of the Church. It is true, of course, that 'Anglicanism' makes a 'strenuous appeal to Scripture'; but, so far as that appeal can be defended on Catholic grounds—and we believe that it is capable of being most fully defended and justified—it is made not to Holy Scripture in an isolated position, but to

the Divine knowledge of the Son was not translated into the mode of His human mind than that the passage should be taken as by Canon Gore.

Ho

1896

Un the who for of p dee nam Fat valuation

thir

a sl

cert gro who of hav Inc tolo wit tion Eus me ma in a s deg unj nec mea to '

relati Dr.

the

enli

the

Can His

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See, e.g., pp. 97, 162-3, 222, note <sup>1</sup>, for illustrations of this.

Holy Scripture in the light of the teaching of the Universal Church.<sup>1</sup>

As one part of the inquiry what is the teaching of the Universal Church on this subject, it is necessary to turn to the writings of the Fathers. And here it is hard to know whether we should be more filled with respect and admiration for Canon Gore's candour in admitting that the whole stream of patristic testimony is against him, or with wonder that so deep and clear a thinker should be willing, while claiming the name of Catholic, to abandon on such a subject what the Fathers thought. To those who have learned to love and value the writers of the undivided Church as above all things the exponents of the Incarnation, filled, beyond everything else, with the knowledge of Christ, it can only come as

a shock to find how he is prepared to treat them.

Canon Gore claims the support of Irenæus and, to a certain extent, of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa. To the grounds of this claim and the value of it we must recur later, when we have noticed his attitude towards the other writers of the early Church. One by one they are swept away as having failed to realize the true meaning of the doctrine of the Incarnation. At a very early point in the discussion we are told that 'current philosophy was, perhaps, overmuch occupied with the impassibility of God,' and that 'to guard the conception of the Divine impassibility philosophical Christians, and Eusebius among them, go dangerously far in minimizing the meaning of the Incarnation' (p. 102). A valuable part of the magnificent sermon of Proclus of Cyzicus which was preached in defence of the Faith against the heresy of Nestoriusa sermon which experience has proved to be in the highest degree illuminative of Christian thought-is put aside as unjustified by the language of the New Testament and as necessitating the application of 'an unnatural meaning, if meaning at all,' to Gospel facts 2 (pp. 104-5). The ascription to 'our Lord on earth' by Clement of Alexandria of 'both the Divine omniscience of the Godhead and the perfect enlightenment of the manhood' is held to be unimportant by the statement, which in itself is true, that 'we should hardly expect from Clement' 'a very full realization of' the 'real

pp. 158-60.

<sup>2</sup> It is not without significance to observe that the passage which Canon Gore condemns is quoted, with evident approval, in Bright, History of the Church, pp. 313-4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> There is much that is useful on the appeal to Holy Scripture in its relation to the authority of the Church in a letter written by Dr. Pusey to Dr. Tholuck in the year 1839. See *Life of E. B. Pusey*, vol. ii. pp. 183-60.

wei

giu

reg

Cai

vie

we

Go

the

sho

the

Gno

Oth God

nati

to

hun

Irei

of (

in l

mai

hun

ove

enc (ad

His

figh

rest

hun

pos

" CC

ranc

emp

acco

The

unu

Lor

actu

hou

ther

of t

OUTW

et ir

er To

humanity' of Christ (pp. 113-4). In St. Athanasius 'the philosophical interest overpowers the evangelical truth' (p. 104), and it is admitted that neither of the two wellknown lines of thought 1 which are found in that great Father about the subjects connected with the passages in St. Luke ii. 52 and St. Mark xiii. 32 and the questions asked by our Lord has anything in common with Canon Gore's own theory (pp. 123-6). Of St. Gregory Nazianzen it is allowed 'that he is not disposed to think of our Incarnate Lord as in any sense really ignorant' (p. 126). While reference is made to the statement that 'one who refers the ignorance to Him who in His Incarnation 2 took everything human upon Himself, and advances in wisdom and favour with God and man, will not fall outside the orthodox apprehension of the matter,'3 St. Basil's own opinion of the absence of ignorance in the Son is plainly stated (p. 127). It is concluded that 'St. Ambrose cannot be reckoned with Athanasius as affirming the reality of a human ignorance in our Lord,' much less as holding that there was ignorance in the Divine Person of the Son (pp. 127-129). So, too, the teaching of Ephraim Syrus, Didymus of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine is in each case rejected (pp. 130-8); and, if a strong phrase in Theodoret concerning our Lord's human ignorance is said to commend 'itself to modern consciences,' it is admitted that Theodoret regarded such ignorance as rightly 'attributed' not 'to the Word,' 'but to the manhood which the Word assumed '(pp. 131-2). No more is claimed for the assertion of human ignorance by Leontius of Byzantium; the common opinion in the Church that the Agnoetæ 4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In some passages St. Athanasius seems to admit that there was ignorance of some matters in the human mind of our Lord; in other passages he writes as if our Lord merely appeared to be ignorant for our sakes. See *Orat. c. Arian.* iii. 37-54.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We have adopted this translation of οἰκονομικῶς from Canon Gore. St. Basil, Ερ. ccxxxvi. I: τὸ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἐπὶ τὸν οἰκονομικῶς πάντα καταδεξάμενον καὶ προκόπτοντα παρὰ Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις σοφία καὶ χάριτι λαμβάνων τις, οἰν ἔξω τῆς εἰσεβοῦς ἐνεχθήσεται διανοίας. As translated by Canon Gore, the opinion here regarded as non-heretical, though not accepted by St. Basil, would ascribe ignorance to the humanity of Christ. There is difficulty about the meaning of οἰκονομικῶς. Ερ. viii. 6 should be compared.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Canon Gore is inclined to regard the distinctive characteristic or the Agnoetæ to have been the ascription of ignorance to the humanity of Christ. Others have thought they ascribed ignorance to His Person: see, e.g. Liddon, Bampton Lectures, p. 470. In either case, the fact that they were reckoned as heretics shows that Canon Gore's theory of our Lord's consciousness would in the sixth century have been regarded severely by orthodox Christians.

Jan.

the

uth'

vell-

ther

uke

our

eory

t he

ense

the

o in

and

not

St.

Son

rose

ality

that

27-

s of

if a

man

ces,'

e as

med zan-

tæ 4

was

other

our

re.

τάντα

άριτι d by

not

nrist.

ould

ic or

ty of

son:

that our rded were heretics is spoken of as if unimportant; St. Leo, Eulogius, St. Gregory the Great, St. John Damascene are all regarded as in error (pp. 154-66).

What, then, is to be said about the three Fathers of whom Canon Gore speaks as in different degrees anticipating his view? The first is St. Irenæus. It will be convenient that we should quote at length the main passage in which Canon

Gore discusses his position:

'Irenæus, assuming the principle of the Incarnation, emphasizes the reality of our Lord's entrance into human experience. That he should have done this is no more than what we might expect from the greatest of the opponents of Gnosticism. . . . Opposition to Gnosticism leads the Church teachers to a healthy emphasis, as on other things, so also on the reality of the human "flesh" of Jesus. God really was made man. The Supreme did really enter into nature and manhood. Tertullian chiefly emphasizes this in regard to physical processes and sufferings and in regard to the actual human birth and human sufferings of the Son of God. Irenæus emphasizes it more broadly. He claims that God, the Son of God, did truly enter into all that makes up the nature of man in body, mind, and soul. Not only, then, did He reveal God to man, but He "exhibited man to God." He really went through human struggles and won a human victory. "He struggled and overcame; He was man fighting for his fathers, and by His obedience paying the debt of their disobedience: for He bound the strong 1 (adversary), and loosed the weak (captives) and gave deliverance to His creatures, destroying sin." And in order to fight the human fight fully, "He passed through every age, from infancy to manhood, restoring to each communion with God." And in order that His human struggle may be believed to have been real, St. Irenæus postulates a quiescence of the Divine Word "while He was tempted and dishonoured and crucified and slain" as on the other hand its "co-operation with the man (or manhood) in His victory and endurance and goodness, and resurrection and ascension." 2 Irenæus thus emphasizes the reality of our Lord's human experiences. And, in accordance with this, the reality of our Lord's human ignorance. Then he rebukes the would-be omniscience of the Gnostics: "Unreasonably puffed up, you audaciously declare that you know the unutterable mysteries of God: unreasonably-seeing that even the Lord, the very Son of God, allowed that the Father alone knew the actual day and hour of judgment, saying plainly, of that day and hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, except the Father only. therefore, the Son did not blush to refer to the Father the knowledge of that day, but said what is true, neither let us blush to reserve to

<sup>1</sup> The italics are not ours.

VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Irenæus, C. Haer. III. xix. 3: ωσπερ γὰρ ἢν ἄνθρωπος, ἵνα πειρασθῆ, οῦτως καὶ λόγος, ἵνα δοξασθῆ · ἡσυχάζοντος μεν τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ πειράζεσθαι et inhonorari καὶ σταυροῦσθαι καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν · συγγινομένου δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐν τῷ νικᾶν καὶ ὑπομένειν καὶ χρηστεύεσθαι καὶ ἀνίστασθαι καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι.

is

is

in

S

S

E

CO

C

p

. (

ir

th

P

V

in

SI m

cl w

m

to

na

de

T

hi

SU

of

God those points in inquiries which are too high for us. For no one is above his master. . . . For if any one ask the reason why the Father, though in all things holding communion with the Son, was declared by the Lord alone to know the day and hour; he could not at present find one more suitable, or proper, or less perilous than this (for our Lord is the only true master)—that we may learn through Him, that the Father is over all. For the Father, He says, is greater than I. And that even in respect of knowledge the Father is put over [the Son] is announced to us by our Lord, in order that we too, so long as we belong to the fashion of this world, may leave to God perfect knowledge, and such investigations [as the Gnostics were presuming to undertake]." 1 It might appear as if St. Irenæus attributed this ignorance to the Son simply as Son; but the phrase "so long as we belong to the fashion of the world," and a previous expression,2 "while we are still in this world," show that he was thinking of human ignorance generally, and therefore of our Lord's ignorance as belonging simply to that mortal state which he assumed in assuming humanity. To the person 3 of the Son Incarnate, then, as he was among men, Irenæus certainly attributes limitation of knowedge ' (pp. 108-12).

We must enter our protest against the word 'certainly' in the last sentence. The passage in St. Irenæus is one of great difficulty, on which it beseems an interpreter to hold his judgment in suspense. It is possible, on the ground of the general purpose of the argument, and of particular expressions in the course of it, to regard the reference as being to ignorance in the human mind only of our Lord.<sup>4</sup> It

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Irenæus, C. Haer. II. xxviii. 6-8: 'Irrationabiliter autem inflati, audaciter inenarrabilia Dei mysteria scire vos dicitis; quandoquidem et Dominus, ipse Filius Dei, ipsum judicii diem et horam concessit scire solum Patrem manifeste dicens : de die autem illa et hora nemo scit, neque Filius, nisi Pater solus. Si autem scientiam diei illius Filius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est, neque nos erubescamus quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos reservare Deo; nemo enim super magistrum est . . . Etenim si quis exquirat causam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, solus scire horam et diem a Domino manifestatus est; neque aptabilem magis neque decentiorem nec sine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniat in præsenti (quoniam enim solus verax magister est Dominus), ut discamus per ipsum super omnia esse Patrem. Etenim Pater, ait, major me est. Et secundum agnitionem itaque præpositus esse Pater annunciatus est a Domino nostro ad hoc, ut et nos, in quantum in figura hujus mundi sumus, perfectam scientiam et tales quæstiones concedamus Deo.'

St. Irenæus, C. Haer. II. xxviii. 7, 'nos adhuc in terra conversantes.'
 The italics are not ours.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> It was so regarded e.g. by Dr. Liddon. See his Bampton Lectures, p. 468: 'St. Irenæus discovers in our Lord's human ignorance a moral argument against the intellectual self-assertion of his own Gnostic contemporaries; while he attributes Omniscience to the Divine Nature of Christ in the clearest terms;' and, note b, 'That St. Irenæus is here

an.

no

the

was

uld

han

arn

avs. her

that

ave

tics

æus

rase

ous

nk-

no-

lin , as

OW-

'in

of

old

of

ılar

as

It

flati,

n et cire

eque

buit

quæ

nim n in

nino

sine

olus esse

nem

hoc, tiam

tes.

oral

cor.-

e of

here

is possible, also, because of much in the context, and especially because of the illustrative quotation of the words 'My Father is greater than I,' to recognize an earlier instance of the interpretation of our Lord's saying, which was adopted by St. Basil, according to which the meaning is simply that the Son had no knowledge except by the gift of the Father.1 Either of these methods of treatment is in itself as reasonable as that suggested by Canon Gore, and from neither of them could any support be derived in favour of his theory of the consciousness of our Lord.<sup>2</sup> The other of the two most important passages in St. Irenæus, that which speaks of the quiescence' of the Word, is criticized by Canon Gore himself in a note (p. 110, note 1). And, indeed, its true meaning appears to be that the Word in His incarnate life so restrained the Divine powers which He continued uninterruptedly to possess, that He did not use them to immediately crush temptation or to make the suffering of contempt, of the Passion, of death, impossible. It is really parallel, in its view of the works of the two natures of our Lord in His incarnate life, to the famous passage from the Tome of St. Leo,3 of which Canon Gore, at a later point in his Dissertation, speaks with somewhat scant respect (pp. 162-4). It is a matter, then, of very grave doubt whether he can rightly claim any part of the teaching of St. Irenæus as coinciding with, or approximating to, his own belief.

The second of the three writers is Origen.4 In his commentary on St. Matthew xxiv. 36, he mentions two alternative interpretations of the words 'neither the Son.' According to the first interpretation, the words refer to the human nature of our Lord. According to the second, they mystically denote the ignorance of Christ's Body, the Church. Neither view, then, which Origen here mentions is that of Canon Gore. The comment on Jeremiah i. 6 is possibly rightly claimed by him. That on St. Luke ii. 40 is apparently inconsistent with his theory. In that on St. Luke ii. 52, Origen makes two suggestions, one of which would not harmonize with it, the other of which may perhaps rightly be quoted in its support. Is it

referring to our Lord's humanity is clear from the appeal to His example. Of His Divinity he says (II. xxviii. 7): "Spiritus Salvatoris, qui in eo est, scrutatur omnia, et altitudines Dei." 

1 St. Basil, Ep. ccxxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> The first ascribes ignorance to the manhood only; the second does not ascribe ignorance to our Lord at all.

St. Leo, Ep. xxviii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> The passages referred to are In Matt. Comment. Series 55; In Jer. Hom. i. 7, 8, viii. 8; In Luc. Hom. xix., xx.

not fair to argue that the teaching of Origen is too indefinite and self-contradictory to be of any service to the position of the Dissertation?

The third writer is St. Gregory of Nyssa. Certainly, he speaks of human ignorance in our Lord, and though it is questionable whether the exact force of all his words can rightly be pressed, his language appears to ascribe this ignorance to the Person of the Son. This fact affords no support of value to Canon Gore. St. Gregory of Nyssa, as the Dissertation with honourable candour reminds us elsewhere uses language of a most exaggerated kind in a Eutychian direction. The truth is that, in St. Gregory's writings, there is no uniformly consistent view. On the subject of the Incarnation, as on the subject of Eschatology, he contradicts himself; and it is no more justifiable to use his assertion of ignorance in our Lord than it would be for a champion of Universalism to rely upon passages in which he teaches that form of unbelief.2

We are led to remark that it is very doubtful how far any one of these three writers can be cited in defence of the theory in the Dissertation; that if the support of Origen and St. Gregory of Nyssa should be demonstrated, it would be of little value, since the opinions of both have been the object of suspicion in the Church; and that, even apart from such considerations, if the three writers should all be shown to have held what might rightly be considered an anticipation of Canon Gore's view, it is of no great weight that, when all other Christian writers who speak on the subject are opposed to him, three could be found to have maintained his opinion in the long period from the first century to the birth of Luther.

What, then, are the grounds upon which so learned and skilful a student of the history of the Faith as Canon Gore, and one who moreover says he does 'not believe that, taken on the whole, so much whether of theological or moral illumination is to be gained from any study, outside Holy Scripture, as the great theologians who are called, and legitimately called, "the Fathers" ' (p. 214), has thought it t

0

I

a I

C

to

b

C

iı

r

u

п W

I

re

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The passages referred to are Adv. Apoll. 11, 14, 20, 24, 28, 25, 42;

Adv. Eunom. v. 3, 4, 5; Orat. Cat. Mag. 24.

St. Gregory of Nyssa teaches the future salvation of the Devil in Orat. Cat. Mag. 26; of demons in De Anima et Resur.; of all men in Orat. Cat. Mag. 35. On the other hand, he asserts the everlasting character of the penalties of the lost, and that there is a real danger of incurring them in Adv. eos qui differunt Bapt. This contradiction supplies an instructive comment on his variations on the doctrine of the Incarnation.

an.

ite

of

he

an

10-

ort

ere

ian

ere

he

cts

of

nat

ny

the

ind

of of

on-

ave

of her

to

er. and

ore, ken

oral

oly

and t it

42;

l in

n in

er of

sup-

the

possible to put aside the great body of patristic testimony, supported as it is by the Schoolmen, on the subject of his inquiry? They appear to be three in number. Firstly, the 'apostolic tradition' 'had nothing to say in regard to the consciousness of the incarnate Son. Men were left' in the second and third centuries, ' as now, to the examination of our Lord's words, and to conclusions from the principles involved in the Incarnation' (p. 121; cf. p. 108). Secondly, 'the only ecclesiastical decisions bearing on the present subject, the acceptance of which can fairly be said to be required for the ministry in the Anglican Church,' are 'the actual dogmatic decisions of ecumenical councils,' and he has 'no hesitation in claiming that the theological conclusion' at which he has 'arrived' 'is wholly consistent with' these decisions (p. 207). Thirdly, the attitude taken up by the 'fathers and schoolmen on the subject' 'was due to causes which belonged to' the times in which they lived (p. 213).

We question whether the first of these grounds allows sufficiently for the fulfilment of the promise of our Lord that the Holy Spirit would guide the Church. The Fathers are, of course, witnesses to that unbroken tradition which descended from the teaching of the Apostles and came to be enshrined in the Creeds. But they are a great deal more. If it is true that God the Holy Ghost dwells in the Church, and if the Church itself as the mystical Body of Christ has its Divine side, and if the Word of the Lord has been pledged to a supernatural protection of a most remarkable kind; then a consensus of recognized teachers, practically unanimous, extending over many centuries, may not, to say the least, lightly be ignored. On some matters connected with our Lord's consciousness there are differences of opinion among such recognized teachers. There is a practical consensus according to which the theory that is now placed before us is regarded as an impossibility. That the Eternal Word Himself, even within the sphere of the Incarnation, should be without His Divine knowledge is to the minds of those who make up this consensus the absolutely untenable hypothesis which, whatever the exact truth may be, must be rejected. If, on such a subject, error could be so deep-seated and widely spread and long-continued, it would not be easy to retain belief, founded on the New Testament, in the Divine guidance of Christian thought.

If this is so, what we have placed as the second of the grounds on which Canon Gore justifies his rejection of the teaching of the Fathers and Schoolmen, even if he is right in

his interpretation of the Conciliar decrees, loses much of its significance. We are indeed pledged to the 'actual dogmatic decisions of ecumenical councils' in a way in which we are not pledged to anything else. The acceptance of such decisions can be pressed as a condition of Communion to an extent to which the acceptance of other teaching cannot be. But the whole Church is committed to a body of truth which includes more than the dogmas which have by formal œcumenical decisions been made to be in the highest degree de As a council derives its œcumenical character from. universal consent, so what is really the voice of the whole body, in whatever particular way it may utter its speech, is the organ of God the Holy Ghost. For those who so believe and to us this is part of the Catholic doctrine of the Church we cannot see the possibility of treating a consensus so complete and long-continued as that under consideration in the

way that Canon Gore has treated it.

But, further, we dispute the interpretation of the decrees of the Councils upon which what we have described as his second ground rests. It is contended that while the Councils of Nicæa and Chalcedon and the Third Council of Constantinople did deny that the Divine Nature of the Word was mutable, or that there was any change in His Divine Nature at the Incarnation, there is nothing inconsistent with these decrees in the particular form of the Kenotic theory which Canon Gore himself adopts. With regard to Nicæa he says 'the fathers of the Council had only moral alterability in view in their ecclesiastical decision, as it was only moral alterability which the Arians asserted of Christ, and any idea of moral alterability has in this discussion been expressly repudiated'; and also in 'regard to metaphysical alteration, it must be remembered that in the view here presented the limitation of which the Incarnate Son is the subject is regarded (1) as not affecting His essential being or operation in the universe, (2) as not imposed from without, but an act of His own power' (pp. 208-9). So far as this particular point is concerned, the limitation of the abandonment of Divine consciousness by the Eternal Word to the sphere of the Incarnation does not help the case, for it was with special thought of the Incarnation in view that the Councils declared that there was no change in the Divine Nature of the Son. And we question whether the distinction between 'moral' and 'metaphysical' mutability is, in this connexion, of importance. It is the case that the opponents of Arianism had at heart the

(1

tl

th

tl

us

po

fo

<sup>1</sup> The italics are not ours.

an.

its

tic

re

lean

be.

ch

ude

m.

ole

is

m-

he

ees

his

ils

n-

are

ich

lys

in

ral

lea

sly

on,

the

ded

the

wn

on-

on-

na-

t of

ere

we eta-

It

the

maintenance of the truth of the 'moral' immutability of the Word. If we are not mistaken, they based their conviction of this 'moral' immutability of God the Son on the 'metaphysical' immutability of the Divine Nature, considered as a fundamental law of Christian thought. We have always been accustomed to regard the repetition by the Council of Nicæa in the words  $\hat{\eta}$   $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \tau \hat{o} \nu$   $\hat{\eta}$   $\hat{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega \omega \tau \hat{o} \nu$  as an indication of the emphasis with which the Fathers of the Council were repudiating the possibility of any kind of change in the Nature of the Word. And if that is not an argument which can be pressed very far, there is certainly an entire absence of any evidence to support a view that the Councils, in denying 'moral alterability,' allowed the possibility of 'metaphysical alteration.'

Very significant, in connexion with this subject, is Canon Gore's treatment of the Fourth Lateran Council. The decision of the Council by which it gave 'dogmatic authority' to the denial of Peter Lombard 'that the Divine Nature, as distinguished from the Divine Persons, can be described as either "generating," or "generated," or "proceeding," is said to be 'not only highly precarious in itself, but also to have its origin in a false metaphysical conception of unity and immutability' (pp. 178-9). We should have thought that the Council in this decree was only making the declaration, necessary when the exact question had once been raised, although looser language might at earlier periods rightly have been used, that as soon as one thinks of the Divine Generation or the Divine Procession, it is upon the Persons, not upon the Nature, as subject and object that one's mind must rest.1 And, while on a subtlety of this kind differing language has unquestionably been used at different times, the 'metaphysical' immutability itself of the Divine Nature appears to us to have been affirmed by Catholic Christians whenever To St. Augustine 2 as to St. John it has been considered.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As we have indicated above, we think the decree of the Lateran Council valuable, as based upon a true conception of the Divine immutability. We have the greatest respect for the learning and theological power of Bishop Bull. His treatment of this subject (*Defence of the Nicene Creed*, Iv. i. 9; 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology,' ii. 567-8), however, appears to us much less satisfactory than that in Petavius, *De Trinitate*, VI. xii.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See e.g. De lib. Arb. ii. 17 (§ 45), 'Omnis enim res mutabilis, etiam formabilis sit necesse est;' De Civit. Dei, xi. 10 (§ 1), 'Est itaque bonum solum simplex, et ob hoc solum incommutabile, quod est Deus. Ab hoc bono creata sunt omnia bona, sed non simplicia, et ob hoc mutabilia;' De Nat. boni, 1, 'Ac per hoc si solus ipse commutabilis, omnia quæ fecit, quia ex nihilo fecit, mutabilia sunt;' De Trin. v. 4 (§ 5), 'Nihil itaque

pi

m

C

of

to

tr

te

CO

aı

W

pa

th

po

th

ti

or

ap

VC

G

tin

of

ur

Damascene,<sup>1</sup> to St. Cyril of Alexandria<sup>2</sup> as to Richard of St. Victor,<sup>3</sup> to St. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>4</sup> as to Albert the Great<sup>5</sup> and St. Thomas Aquinas,<sup>6</sup> it is an essential property dependent on the being of the Divine Nature that it knows no change.<sup>7</sup>

In our presentation of the reasons which appear to have led Canon Gore to think it justifiable to reject the teaching of the Fathers and Schoolmen on this subject, we placed third his statement that their attitude 'was due to causes which belonged to' the times in which they lived. It is fair that we should quote at length what he says on this point:

'The defectiveness of the theology of fathers and schoolmen on the subject which we have had under review was due to causes which belonged to their periods.

'1. Accurate interpretation of the text, whether of New Testament authors or of others, is in the main a growth of modern times. The fathers and schoolmen were often in advance of us in theological branches of speculation, but generally behind us in "exegesis."

'2. Again, their philosophical categories as applied to God were abstract and a priori. They did not recognize as much as we have been taught to do that, if the action of reason is implied in the very beginnings of observation, and is thus logically "prior" to experience, yet human nature has no actual contents, it contains no "synthetic propositions" except such as are gained through experience: that is to say, as the reason is gradually awakened by experience to the perception of what is implied in the world and in itself. An a priori philosophy of nature or of history is sure to be at fault, and still more surely an a priori philosophy of God. Most certainly our human knowledge of what God is, what His omnipotence, immutability, omniscience mean, is limited strictly by what God is found to have disclosed of Himself in nature and humanity, by experience, through inspired prophets, and Jesus Christ His Son.

accidens in Deo, quia nihil mutabile aut amissibile. Quod si et illud dici accidens placet, quod licet non amittatur, minuitur tamen vel augetur, sicuti est animæ vita: nam et quamdiu animæ est, tamdiu vivit, et quia semper animæ est, semper vivit: sed quia magis vivit cum sapit, minusque cum desipit, fit etiam hic aliqua mutatio, non ut desit vita, sicuti deest insipienti sapientia, sed ut minus sit: nec tale aliquid in Deo fit, quia omnino incommutabilis manet.'

1 De Fid. orthod. i. 3, 4, 8.

\* In Malach. Comm. xxxvii. (t. iii. p. 856, Aubert); Comm. in Joan. Evang. on i. 14 (t. iv. p. 97), on viii. 29 (t. iv. p. 531); Thesaurus, v. (t. v. a, p. 37), xiii. (t. v. a, p. 127); De recta Fide, 10 (p. 9). A comparison of these passages with one another shows how closely St. Cyril connected the 'metaphysical' and the 'moral' immutability.

<sup>3</sup> De Trinitate, ii. 3, 4.
<sup>4</sup> Orat. xxxiv. 8, 10.
<sup>5</sup> In I. Sent. Dist. viii. art. 1-2.
<sup>6</sup> S. T. I. ix. 1-2.

<sup>7</sup> Compare the valuable dissertation in Pearson, Lectiones de Deo et Attributis, lectio ix. (vol. i. pp. 87-95, ed. Churton).

Jan.

of the

rty

no

ave

gof

ird

ich

we

on

nich

sta-

nes.

ical

vere

ave

rery

nce.

etic

at is

per-

iori

ore

man

lity,

ugh

llud

etur,

quia apit,

icuti

o fit,

oan.

S. V.

ison

cted

eo et

'3. No heresies excited so much antagonism as those which impugned our Lord's Godhead. By none, then, did the Church run so much risk of being driven into opposite extremes. Into such extremes she was not driven so far as her dogmatic decisions were concerned, but the effect of undue reaction is traceable in many even of her greatest schools of theology' (pp. 213-14).

On this passage it is needful to observe:

I. It is true that 'accurate interpretation of the text' is to a very considerable extent 'a growth of modern times.' Those who are familiar with the writings of the Fathers are acquainted with the strange exegesis of particular passages which is continually met with. Nevertheless, the Fathers have the most wonderful power of penetrating to the doctrinal and moral meaning of the Bible, and their value as interpreters of Scripture is immensely beyond their capacity in Moreover, where, as in this matter, it is a mere exegesis. collective judgment which has to be considered, the doctrinal and moral teaching, as distinct from the interpretation of particular passages, must be regarded in the light of the Divine guidance of Christian thought of which we have already written. Further, Canon Gore's reference to the methods of patristic exegesis as bearing on this question presupposes that his view of the Scriptural evidence is a correct one—a position which, as we have said, there is good reason to doubt.

2. It is, again, here presupposed that in the teaching of the Fathers on the doctrine of God, they are merely human interpreters of Scripture and witnesses to an Apostolic tradition which they received. The guidance of God the Holy Ghost, expressly promised by our Lord Himself, is completely The absence of any recognition of the Providential government and supernatural directing of the minds of Catholic thinkers is most noticeable. Nothing that is local or individual can make any claim upon us; but, in so far as a line of thought approaches universality, to that extent it approximates to being what we are taught to regard as the voice of God. And, from another point of view, when Canon Gore contrasts the 'philosophical categories as applied to God' of the Fathers and Schoolmen with those of our own time, we may point out that most Christians, even speaking from the ground of modern methods of thought, would be disposed to echo Dr. Bright's words, 'An actual surrender of Divine prerogatives or perfections by a Divine Person is unthinkable.' 1

3. Reaction in theology is certainly always a danger,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Bright, Morality in Doctrine, p. 333, note <sup>1</sup>.

189

wel

hav

Sci

the

all

tho

apa

cor

of (

wh

the

OL

to

the

'th

as

Bu

Ch

ver

ma

Syl

bes

sid

tio

nec

(p.

val

lea

Di.

we

Ch

hel

hav

wit

val

Pe

mu

wa

ste

tio

but there are strong reasons for thinking that the great Fathers held the balance true on the doctrine of the Incarnation. The writings of, to name no more, St. Athanasius and St. Augustine, St. Leo and St. Cyril of Alexandria, are full of the most sincere and appreciative recognition of our Lord's manhood as well as the most determined insistence on His Godhead. And it was to these, among others, that any such theory as that of Canon Gore's was an untenable hypothesis. We think that the *Dissertation* greatly exaggerates the extent to which scholastic theology minimized the humanity of The condemnation of Nihilianism by Pope Alexander III. in 1177 may rightly be regarded as in accordance with the judgment of recognized theologians of the period. The particular illustration of 'the phraseology of the vestis,' on which Canon Gore lays much stress (pp. 175-8), was used by St. Thomas Aguinas with the most delicate distinctions as to the sense in which it could be rightly employed.2 would such minimizing of the humanity by the Schoolmen, even if it extended more widely and had a greater influence than we are disposed to think, be of value in supporting the theory under consideration; because, in the first place, it would leave the testimony of the Fathers untouched, and the Fathers, no less than the Schoolmen, are opposed to the theory; and, in the second place, the special point that is here at issue is not the reality of the humanity, but what change in the Godhead is compatible with Christian belief.

Our discussion has necessarily taken separate points separately. While that is so, we have endeavoured to keep in view Canon's Gore's appeal that the 'positive evidence' must be regarded 'in its continuity' (p. 205), and to apply that principle to the whole consideration of the subject as

¹ It is not without interest or significance to observe that the Pelagian opponent of St. Augustine taunted Catholic theologians with impairing the Humanity of our Lord. See St. Aug. Op. Imp. c. Jul. iv. 47, vi. 33. Compare Mozley, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, pp. 93-4, who says: 'The doctrine of our Lord's Divinity modifies the truths connected with His Humanity in this way, that He who was both God and Man cannot be thought of even as Man exactly the same as if He

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> S.T. III. ii. 6, ad primum: 'Humana ergo natura in Christo assimilatur habitui, id est, vestimento; non quidem quantum ad accidentalem unionem, sed quantum ad hoc quod Verbum videtur per humanam naturam, sicut homo per vestimentum; et etiam quantum ad hoc quod vestimentum mutatur, quia scilicet formatur secundum figuram ejus qui induit ipsum, quia sua forma non mutatur propter vestimentum. Et similiter humana natura assumpta a Verbo Dei est meliorata, ipsum autem Verbum Dei non est mutatum, ut Augustinus exponit.' Compare St. Aug. De diver. Quast. octoginta tribus, lxxiii.

Jan.

reat

and

ll of

rd's His

uch

esis.

tent

can-

ance

riod.

stis.

used

s as Nor

nen,

the

e, it

the

ory;

ssue

oints

кеер

nce '

oply

t as

the

with Jul.

ation.

s the

both

if He

o as-

iden-

anam

quod s qui

psum

pare

well as to the evidence from the New Testament. We have tried, too, to remember the pre-eminence of Holy Scripture, and 'to be true' to the 'facts' that are found in the 'utterances of prophets and inspired men, but most of all' in 'the deeds and words of the incarnate Son' (ibid.), though we cannot admit that Scripture is to be interpreted apart from the mind of the Universal Church, or that a consensus of Christian teachers does not imply the guidance of God the Holy Ghost. As to the fourth point of the appeal which we quoted at length, we gladly affirm that the fuller the recognition of what Holy Scripture really teaches about 'our Lord's human state,' the richer will be the practical value to Christians of 'the Church's teaching.' When we reviewed the Bampton Lectures for 1891, we wrote at some length on 'the human sympathy of Christ,' and ventured to describe it as 'one of the most precious truths of the Incarnate life." But we cannot admit 'that the general teaching of the Catholic Church for many centuries about our Lord has removed Him very far from human sympathies' (ibid.). There must be many who owe truths about the human example and sympathy of Christ which have been a stay to their soul's best life to a wealth of devotional literature, which has existed side by side with 'the development of an exaggerated devotion to His Mother and the Saints,' which Canon Gore connects with 'the minimizing of the meaning of His Manhood' (p. 206). Many, too, are those of whom it is true that the value they attach to the Humanity of our Lord has been learned in that school of historical Christianity which the Dissertations bid us, on this point, depreciate. And, if it were the case that 'the general teaching of the Catholic Church for many centuries' had lost Christ as Man, it would be a little hard for us to continue to believe that the gates of hell have not prevailed against the Church.

As we have read this second *Dissertation*, two thoughts have continually recurred to us. One of them has been the possibility of laying emphasis on the reality and completeness with which God became Man in such a way as to impair the value of the fact that human nature was taken into the one Person of God the Word. We meet from time to time with much in contemporary writings which seems to us to tend towards placing the centre of Personality in the manhood instead of in the Godhead. It is of the essence of the Incarnation that the Divine Word took human nature to be the instrument of Deity, the manifestation of the invisible God,

<sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review, January 1892, pp. 279-82.

the means of quickening the human race with new life. Such a work is inextricably bound up with the fact that the centre of Personality is in the Divine Nature.\(^1\) The theological truth and the practical value of the Incarnation alike depend on the maintenance of the doctrine, \(^1\) Not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God.\(^1\) This, we are sure, Canon Gore would himself emphatically affirm. We do not think his view of the Incarnation will be ultimately found to be compatible with this vital truth.

The second thought to which we have referred is that of the good Providence of God in the growth of clearness of definition and apprehension of meaning of the truths of the Faith. It has been part of the work of the Church-it was so pre-eminently in the early centuries of her history—to formulate with increasing accuracy the definitions and rela-tions of the unchanging truth. This is the explanation of tions of the unchanging truth. the use at earlier times of much language which at later times would necessarily be rejected. The expression of the doctrine of the Logos by St. Justin Martyr is less easy to understand than that which is found in St. Athanasius. The phraseology which the first writer uses could hardly in all respects have been accepted by the second. It is not that there was no objective reality, unalterably true. It is not that there was no permanent tradition of the Christian Faith. that one writer or the other was heretical. It is that as time went on the phraseology of definition and the relation of truths came to be fixed and to be understood in the mind of the Church expressed by her theologians.2 There is language

1 See Wilberforce, The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus

Christ, chap. vi.

in St. write heres are p of a Provi the w ortho mind were have temp which tion 1 and o way thous as to Holy is H Cano just a undu the v that

1896

Incar of the

Father by say that a August un dé Christmont' than in enem refers rende would who i that point

456);

MIIX

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> There is a valuable article on St. Justin Martyr by Canon H. S. Holland in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. See especially p. 574: ¹It must be remembered that it was inevitable that the natural and unsystematized language used before the Arian controversy should be capable of an Arian interpretation. . . It could only be at the end of a most subtle and delicate reflection that Christian logic could possibly realize that it was bound, if it would be finally consistent with itself, to class the derived Being of the Son, by virtue of the absolute eternity of its derivation, on the side of rò dyemprón rather than on that of rà yemprá. Justin, in the full flush of readiness to sweep in to the service of faith the dear and familiar language of his former Platonism, may have left himself unguarded and careless on this uttermost point of the philosophy of the Incarnation; but it will not easily be doubted—by anyone who has observed how he develops the full Divinity of the Son over all the ground which his logic covered with a boldness and a vigour that, in face of the inevitable obstacles, prejudices, misunderstandings, excited by such a creed, are perfectly astonishing—what answer he would have given if the final issue of the position had once presented itself definitely to him?'

an.

ich

of

ith

he

od-

d.

llv

be

of

of

he

ras

-to

la-

of

ne

nd

gy

ive

no

as

me

ths

he

ge

sus

ally iral uld

end

bly to of

the im-

of

has

ind

the a

the

?"

in St. Chrysostom which would hardly have been used by a writer of full and accurate orthodoxy, in whose thought the heresy of Pelagianism had filled a prominent place.1 are phrases in St. Cyril of Alexandria which the experience of a later generation of necessity laid aside.2 And as the Providence of God in the systematization of theology amended the words and to some extent the methods of those who were orthodox, so also the same Providence working in the general mind of the Church rejected views of God and man which This is a point which we were incompatible with the truth. have often noticed to have been forgotten or ignored by contemporary writers. We have read much, for instance, in which there does not appear to have been the least realization that the distinctive theories of Origen were deliberately To ignore in this and distinctly set aside by the Church. way what Christians have done is to go back in the order of thought and to refuse to be taught wisdom by events, as well as to fail to appreciate the Providential ordering of God the Holy Ghost, and the Presence of Christ in the Church, which is His Body and His Bride. Now we cannot think that Canon Gore is unmindful of this as a general truth. Only, just as we have already pointed out that he seems to us most unduly to limit the extent to which the Church speaks with the voice of God, so too we must now express our conviction that his general attitude towards historical Christianity, on the subject of this *Dissertation*, is a retrograde step.

As we study the New Testament and the facts of the Incarnate life, we see nothing to lead us to question the truth of the doctrines which, to the best of our belief, are bound up

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Conc. Chalc. pars ii. act. 1, 5 (Hardouin, Concilia, ii. 128, 456); Conc. Constant. ii. col. viii. can. 8 (ibid. iii. 198).

¹ See on this point Bright, Lessons from the Lives of three great Fathers, Appendix viii. Dr. Bright ends his discussion of the subject by saying (pp. 245-6): 'Tillemont, with a touching simplicity, suggests that "if St. Chrysostom could have had one or two conferences with St. Augustine, there is every reason to believe that he would have become un défenseur aussi parfait qu'intrépide de la véritable grace de Jésus-Christ" (xi. 357). However this may be, it is obvious that, in Tillemont's words, Chrysostom had "considered man " rather in his original than in his fallen estate: "he had not had to contend with the Pelagian enemies of grace, but with Manichæan and other heretics who were enemies of nature and of free will." Montfaucon similarly, and fairly, refers to the fact that he preached before the Pelagian controversy had rendered exactness of language on this point indispensable; and it would therefore be inequitable to class him with the Semi-Pelagians who formulated their denial of prevenient grace nearly twenty years after that controversy had begun. Still, when all is said, this is the weak point in Chrysostom's teaching.'

in the mind of the Universal Church throughout the whole course of her history, that the Divine Nature is in all ways immutable, and that the Eternal Word, on becoming Man, retained unchanged all the Attributes which He possessed as God.

II. The subject of the second *Dissertation* is 'Transubstantiation and Nihilianism.' The object of it is thus described by its author:

'i. To describe the theological process by which Transubstan-

tiation became a dogma of the Roman Church.

'ii. To indicate the metaphysical difficulties in which the dogma is involved, and to show how it violates the accepted analogy of the Incarnation, and the philosophical principle which is involved in the Incarnation, viz. that the supernatural and divine does not annihilate the natural and material substance in which it manifests and communicates itself.

'iii. To answer the question—Why then did not the analogy of the Incarnation doctrine, dogmatically expressed as it was in the decree which emphasized the permanent reality of our Lord's manhood, bar

the way to the dogma of Transubstantiation?' (p. 229).

The Dissertation is marked by learning and scholarly methods. It shows with clearness the objections which may rightly be raised against Transubstantiation as contrary to what may be discerned about the general ways of the operations of God and to Patristic teaching and analogies on the subject of the Eucharist. The considerations which it suggests are of greater weight against the grosser view of Transubstantiation than against the form in which the dogma is explained by Roman theologians. But they apply also to the latter, since the presence of the 'accidents' of bread and wine in which their 'res' has ceased to exist cannot be regarded as affording a sufficient parallel to the continued existence of the Humanity of Christ in the Incarnate Life of the Word.

We are prepared, then, to recognize the value and assent to the main conclusions on the doctrine of the Eucharist of this Dissertation. We cannot, however, express an unqualified approval. We have grave doubts whether the statement that the language of St. Augustine 'may fairly be interpreted on a receptionist theory like Hooker's' (p. 232) can be justified. There are, unquestionably, passages in his writings of which, if they are taken by themselves, it is a possible interpretation that they denote 'a receptionist theory,' and fail to assert that the wicked receive in the Sacrament the Body and Blood of Christ. But that interpretation of these passages, in our opinion, ceases to be tenable when they are carefully com-

pare of th sage preta Chris good expr good If it hims grou teach Sacr good gests incom tine ment by 1 incom nowl this : has t

1896

with V theol stant of Be unde of the by not to spright

teach

society
worth
In Ps
4
in the
tually
De B

Forbe Gore. Jan.

ole

ays

Ian,

l as

ub-

bed

tan-

gma

v of

ved

not

fests

fthe

cree

bar

arly

may

vhat

s of

t of

e of

tion

l by

ince

hich

ord-

the

sent t of

ified

that

on

fied.

tion

that

d of

our

om-

pared with the rest of St. Augustine's teaching on the subject of the Eucharist and with his general theology. These passages may rightly be described as allowing either an interpretation that only the good receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament or an interpretation that only the good so receive beneficially.1 There are other passages which expressly and unmistakably assert that all communicants, good and bad, receive the Body and the Blood of Christ,2 If it is to be supposed that St. Augustine is consistent with himself, the only tenable course is to interpret the former group of passages with the help of the latter, so that his teaching is seen to be that all communicants receive in the Sacrament the Body and Blood of Christ, but that only the good receive them to their souls' health. Canon Gore suggests that the language 'is in fact probably somewhat inconsistent' (p. 232). That it is less likely that St. Augustine contradicts himself than that the explanation we have mentioned holds good is, we think, very strongly supported by the fact that, although he was very ready to correct inconsistencies and to acknowledge changes of opinion, he nowhere, either in the Retractationes or elsewhere, states that this is one of the subjects upon which at different times he has thought differently. And it is to be observed that such teaching as we have supposed to be his is entirely harmonious with his doctrines of the Church 3 and the effects of Baptism.4

We question whether Canon Gore is quite fair to the theologians to whom the growth of the dogma of Transubstantiation is largely due. Even on the most favourable view of Berengar's position, it is likely that Lanfranc and others understood him to be in effect denying the objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament; and it is by no means certain that the phrases they use, which appear to speak of the physical eating of the Body and Blood, are rightly interpreted in a carnal sense.<sup>5</sup> However that may be,

<sup>1</sup> E.g. In Joan. Evang. xxvi. 18.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. De Bapt. c. Donat. v. 8; Ad Donat. post collat. 20 (§ 27).

<sup>3</sup> I.e. that the Church is a visible society, and that all in the visible society are part of the Church, but that this fact benefits only those who worthily are in it: see e.g. De Bapt. c. Donat. v. 20; De Unit. Eccl. 74; In Psal. lxx. Serm. ii. 12; De Civit. Dei, i. 35.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. that Baptism outside the Church places those who receive it in the objective position of baptized Christians, but that they will spiritually be benefited only as charity leads them to the Church: see e.g.

De Bapt. c. Donat. passim; In Psal. lxxvii. 2.

<sup>5</sup> It is worth while to compare the view taken of this controversy in Forbes, *Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 539-47, with that advocated by Canon Gore.

1896

been,

it is at any rate due to the writers in question to acknowledge that, if they were guilty of exaggerations in a particular direction, they at least maintained, and handed down to succeeding times, the vital truth of the Presence of Christ in His Sacrament. It may, of course, be said that the teaching which was based upon theirs at a later time provoked the reaction against Eucharistic doctrine which worked so great havoc in the sixteenth century. It is at least as tenable a view that, had the opinions of Berengar and his followers prevailed, the truth which we have described as vital would have been lost. And the opinion that the Fourth Lateran Council meant to affirm the Real Presence of Christ rather than the doctrine now known as Transubstantiation is certainly capable of defence.\(^1\)

Canon Gore thinks that the cause of the growth of Transubstantiation was the spread of Nihilianism. We have already said that we think he exaggerates the extent to which our Lord's Humanity was 'minimized.' We cannot find that Nihilianism was ever sufficiently prevalent or sufficiently influential to have effects so marked as he ascribes to it. It is hard to believe that theologians so acute as those of the scholastic period would have accepted the Papal condemnation of this heresy, and at the same time would have

See Palmer, Treatise on the Church of Christ, pt. iv. chap. xi. § 2: 'Even if we admitted that it was the intention of this synod to define the modern Roman opinion of Transubstantiation as "de fide," it would not follow that its definition was binding upon the Church; but there are very reasonable grounds for doubting that the synod had such an intention . . . The decree made at this synod uses indeed the term "Transubstantiation" to express the μεταστοιχείωσις, or transelementation, by which the Sacramental elements become the Body and Blood of Christ: as the Fathers had used the words mutatio, transitio, migratio, transfiguratio, μεταβολή, μεταρρύθμισις, μετασκευασμός, μεταστοιχείωσις, μετασόησις, &c. ; but though the term "Transubstantiation," as Bossuet observes, naturally implies "a change of substance," this by no means settles the question; for it does not determine whether "substance" is used in the Aristotelic or the popular sense; whether the change is physical, and in itself corresponding to other changes whether natural or miraculous, or entirely sacramental, spiritual, and ineffable; in fine, whether it be partial or total . . . This renders it very probable that Innocentius, in the Synod of Lateran, did not intend to establish anything except the doctrine of the Real Presence. In fact, the question was not then with those who denied the modern doctrine of Transubstantiation; it was with the Manichæans, who denied the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. . . . I conclude that the term was employed, not with any intention of establishing a specific view of the Real Presence; but simply as equivalent to "conversion," "transformation," "change," &c., which had been employed before and continued to be employed afterwards to express the same thing.'

of th which natur the P times cally anyth mark tende and 1 thus g nation logian were natura view o of hur large witho Schoo They existe them senter groun the va ready of the Middl domai that p fitness unbeli the wh aspect the pr should of Eve philoso

ton Lect on Unit

part to such a an.

lge

lar

to

in

ing

the

eat

e a

ers

uld

ran

her

nly

an-

ave

to

not

ıffi-

s to

e of

on-

ave

12:

the

are

tion

subby

rist:

ans-

ι€Тα-

suet

eans

" is

e is

al or

fine, that

any-

was

ntia-

ce of

em-Real

ion,"

o be

been, consciously or unconsciously, founding their doctrine of the Eucharist upon it. There is another possible theory which, to our minds, is far more reasonable. It would be natural that in the emphasis which Christians would lay on the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ it would sometimes be thoughtlessly forgotten and sometimes untheologically denied that in the consecrated elements there was anything else at all. Where there was unbelief, more or less marked, about the Eucharist, there would be a natural tendency to increase the emphasis on the Sacred Presence, and to say little about the bread and wine. There might thus grow up, quite apart from any opinion about the Incarnation, a popular view, to a certain extent affecting theologians as well as the people, that the consecrated elements were simply the Body and Blood of our Lord. It would be natural that with many this opinion would include a carnal view of the nature of the Presence. He takes a sanguine view of human minds who supposes that he will be able to teach large numbers of persons the doctrine of Christ's Presence without any of them looking at It in a carnal light. Schoolmen, then, would find such an opinion as this existing. They found, also, to an extent that is not always realized, the existence of unbelief and felt the pressure of it.1 Do we read them wrongly if we see beneath their clear-cut and technical sentences the glow of a great hope of meeting unbelief on ground on which it would fight, and refuting it on principles the value of which it could realize? There was an instrument ready to hand in the philosophy of Aristotle. The influence of the Greek philosopher on the Christian theologians of the Middle Ages is one of the most interesting questions in the domain of the history of thought. Are there not many signs that part of the explanation is to be found in the seeming fitness of such a philosophic weapon against contemporary It was necessary, so they thought, to formulate unbelief? the whole Christian system, so that it might present a logical aspect and appeal to philosophical minds. It was as if, in the present day, an enthusiastic student of natural science should form his theological beliefs with the help of the theory of Evolution. And in this employment of the Aristotelian philosophy in the services of theology, it would be no small part to be able to represent the doctrine of the Eucharist in such a way as would make it appear to be intelligible and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See e.g. St. Anselm, Cur Deus Homo, i. 4. Compare Liddon, Bampton Lectures, p. 125, and the references there given to Newman, Lectures on University Subjects, pp. 296-7; Milman, Latin Christianity, vi. 444. VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

rational. We may, perhaps, see the mistake they made. It may be clear to us that to build up theology on the theories of other sciences is to risk the discrediting of the theological beliefs if the scientific theories should ever be disproved. It may be open to us to insist on an impressive lesson by pointing to the harm that has been done by stereotyping, for a large part of the Church, the particular dogma of the Eucharist which is due to the Schoolmen. But at least let us give them credit for an earnest wish to maintain Sacramental truth amid many difficulties and a real love of that Presence of our Lord on which so much of the soul's life depends.

At the end of this *Dissertation*, Canon Gore alludes to the question of the use of the phrase 'Transubstantiation,' as distinct from the doctrine which has historically, in the West,

been associated with the word:

'But it may be said: Granted all this, yet if Transubstantiation is a dogmatic term of the Latin Church, which has also been accepted by the Orthodox and Russian Churches of the East, and if the Latin schoolmen have abandoned the grossness of its original use, may we not, in the interests of unity, accept the phrase? To this pleading I should reply that it is quite true that it is possible to minimize the meaning of Transubstantiation till it becomes practically compatible with an acceptance of the permanence of the natural elements in the ordinary sense of these terms, coupled with a denial of their permanence in a laboured metaphysical sense, which is no longer in use among philosophical writers other than Roman Catholics. Thus Cardinal Franzelin says: "It is demonstrable, as well from the reason of the Sacrament as from the clear teaching of the Fathers, that that which in the most holy Sacrament is the immediate object of the senses is something objectively real;" and this sort of language may be pressed till Transubstantiation is made to mean almost practically nothing. But, as was indicated above, the mere fact that it must be concluded from the doctrine that the heavenly substances vanish when digestion begins, and the old substances recur, is a sign that the real force of the doctrine cannot be finally evaded. Further, it can never be a satisfactory settlement to accept a phrase in a sense so unreal that you are not prepared to apply it anywhere else. Finally, to accept the phrase in regard to the Eucharist is to abandon a great principle which runs through all theology-the principle that the supernatural does not annihilate or supersede the natural '(pp. 284-5).

We have no love of the word 'Transubstantiation.' Rather we recognize in its history very solid reasons against choosing it to express our belief. Still, we are bound to say that, if it should be clear—as is certainly not the case at the present

time-Christe and if accepti stood t then, w a mere And it anothe when h μεταπο indicat the lar ascribe continu of Jeru in their elemen convey of even was inn made c philoso reasons

1896

III.
on 'the very go historical shown to been us clearness. We are which use the shown to be a shown

furthere

'It is "colt" in Matt.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> On very painful subjects of this kind it must not be forgotten that Roman theologians teach that the 'accidents' nourish.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> De la <sup>2</sup> Cat. <sup>3</sup> Com

subject if to that fro phraseolo sions in ea of the hist

Jan.

It

ories

gical

by

, for

the

et us ental

ence

the

dis-

Vest,

ation

epted

Latin

y we

e the

atible

n the

erma-

n use

Thus

n the

thers,

f lan-

lmost

t that

tances

a sign

irther,

inse so

great

t the 84-5).

ather

osing

t, if it

resent en that

It

time—that the great object of the external reunion of Christendom could be furthered by the adoption of the word, and if it should be possible for us to accept the word without accepting the philosophy which it has generally been understood to denote, as has been the case in the East; it would then, we think, be unnecessarily stickling for what had become a mere matter of phraseology if we were to refuse the word. And it may perhaps be argued that the principle of this is in another place substantially admitted by Canon Gore himself when he contends, with great justice, that the use of the word μεταποιοῦνται by St. John of Damascus 1 does not in itself indicate that he held a 'theory of Transubstantiation;' that the language of the treatise De Sacramentis, sometimes ascribed to St. Ambrose, is compatible with a belief in the continued existence of the elements; and that both St. Cyril of Jerusalem 2 and St. Cyril of Alexandria 3 use words which, in their exact meaning, would affirm the annihilation of the element in one or another Sacrament, without intending to convey any such idea (pp. 230-1). It is true that the course of events sometimes makes unjustifiable a word which once was innocent. In this case we think, providing it could be made clear that by accepting the word we did not accept the philosophy, injury to truth might be avoided, while adequate reasons for believing that external reunion might thus be furthered would strongly call for its use.4

III. We have left to the last the first Dissertation, that on 'the Virgin Birth of our Lord.' Its apologetic value is very great. The objections sometimes urged against the historical character of the event are calmly discussed, and shown to be insufficient for the purpose for which they have been used, and the positive evidence is stated with great clearness and skill. We cannot, indeed, assent to every word. We are very far from recognizing the probability of the theory

which underlies the following statement:

'It is quite possible that the introduction of the "ass" beside the "colt" in Matt. xxi. 2, the specification of "thirty pieces of silver" in Matt. xxvi. 15 (cp. xxvii. 3-10), the mingling of "gall" with wine

<sup>2</sup> Cat. Myst. iii. 3.

Comm. in Joan. Evang. on iii. 5 (t. iv. p. 147, Aubert).

<sup>1</sup> De Fide orthod. iv. 13.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Canon Gore would have been in a better position for discussing this subject if he had not restricted any detailed consideration of the evidence to that from the period between 800 A.D. and 1215 A.D. The question of phraseology needs to be considered in the light both of varying expressions in early writers who agreed in holding central Eucharistic truth and of the history of Sacramental doctrine since 1215.

in Matt. xxvii. 34—details where St. Matthew is unsupported by the other Evangelists—may be modifications due to the influence of the language of Zechariah and the Psalmist respectively '(p. 32).

But the essay as a whole commands our warmest sympathy and admiration; and besides its historical value, we have observed a passage of great theological insight:

'Granted that the eternal Son of God did at a certain moment of time take flesh by a real Incarnation in the womb of Mary; granted that He was born as Man, without change of personality, or addition of another personality, but simply by the assumption of a new nature, and by an entrance into new conditions and experience-granted in this sense the Incarnation of the Son of God in the womb of Mary, can we conceive it to have taken place by the ordinary process of generation? Do we not inevitably associate with the ordinary process of generation the production of a new personality? Must not the denial of the Virgin Birth involve the position that Jesus was simply a new human person, in whatever specially intimate relations with God? This seems to the present writer to be very probably the case, but at the same time to be a question very difficult to argue. the argument becomes almost irresistible when the question is removed from the idea of Incarnation, strictly considered, to the associated idea of the sinless humanity, the humanity of a "Second Adam."

'Jesus Christ was a new departure in human life. . . . In Him we really find a "Second Adam," a new manhood. . . . Christ demands . . . a fundamental moral reconstruction of humanity, and He makes it possible because He offers to men a new life. He offers to reproduce in each man who will believe in Him and yield himself to Him, the quality of His own life, by the bestowal of His own Himself the New Man, He can make all men new. But granted that in this fundamental sense Christ Jesus is a new moral creation, is it possible that this new moral creation can have involved anything short of a new physical creative act? Does not all we know of physical heredity, all we know of the relation of spirit and body, lead us to believe that the miracle of a new moral creation must mean the miracle of a new physical creation? If the moral character was new must not the stuff of the humanity have been new too? Must not the physical generation of the Second Adam have been such as to involve at once His community with our nature, and His exemption from it?' 1 (pp. 64-6).

And it is a satisfaction to find the author saying:

'Considering the position which the Virgin Birth holds in the creeds, it cannot be denied that the authority of the Christian Church is committed to it as a fact beyond recall. To admit that its historical position is really doubtful would be to strike a mortal blow at

We are not satisfied with the phrase 'exemption from it,' which hardly, we think, expresses accurately what Canon Gore evidently means.

the auth

1896

in' the of thos regain.' trying writer, cannot

Gre to the of their some re present be that possible ticular Church of parti that, w with we they sh which t their va for a m lines of battle t selves : Bible, o within o characte

of a verupon di with Ca Tractaria teachii thought the Trahypothe prophec recalls, I spiration

Jan.

y the

f the

athy

have

ent of

anted

dition

ature.

the authority of the Christian Church as a guide to religious truth in any real sense' (p. 67).

IV. Canon Gore, in his preface, expresses the 'hope that in' the second *Dissertation* he 'shall have satisfied one or two of those whose approval' he is 'most anxious to keep or to regain.' And it is impossible to read the volume without trying to estimate the general theological position of the writer, as well as his attitude on particular questions. We

cannot say we are reassured by such consideration.

Great as were the services which the Tractarians rendered to the Church in England, it is only natural that some parts of their work should need further investigation, and that in some respects their attitude should fail to meet needs of the present time which it is right to consider. It may very well be that a more critical treatment of the Fathers than was possible for them, which should enter more fully into the particular place which each Father fills in the theology of the Church, and aim at more exact consideration of the meaning of particular passages, was needed. It could not be expected that, with all the Tractarians had to do, and actually did with wonderful learning, and insight, and skill, and patience, they should leave nothing in the field of patristic study in which those who should come after them might add value to their valuable work. It may well be, also, that there was room for a more complete recognition of some modern methods and lines of thought than their history, and time, and the special battle they had to fight, made possible for them. We ourselves should have cordially welcomed a treatment of the Bible, of the Fathers, of theological questions generally, which, within certain limits, would have differed from well-known characteristics of the Tractarians' work.

Such a readjustment would have allowed, in our opinion, of a very complete defence and justification if it had proceeded upon different lines from those which have become associated with Canon Gore's name. So great an abandonment of the Tractarian view of authority and conception of the Church as a teaching body, as is involved in the repudiation of patristic thought in these *Dissertations*, means a radical departure from the Tractarian standpoint. The extent to which certain critical hypotheses about Holy Scripture, which the reference to prophecy on page 32 of the present work not unnaturally recalls, have been admitted as compatible with belief in inspiration, passes beyond any such recognition of the value of

Mary, ess of rocess of the simply s with e case, But

is re-

asso-

christ ty, and e offers himself is own But r moral

body, t mean vas new cust not ch as to

Church its hisblow at

y means.

<sup>1</sup> Preface, p. ix.

modern critical work as we should have thought to be possible. The view of the consciousness of the Eternal Word within the sphere of the Incarnation which is now insisted on leads, as Canon Gore himself admits, to a revision of the idea of the immutability of God. Such a revision, in our judgment, imperils everything in faith and morals. All upon which man rests for thought and for practice depends upon the Being of God. Of that Being, if historical Christianity is to be believed. the immutability which Canon Gore questions is a true attribute. Those who deny it in its metaphysical aspect will hardly be able for long to defend it on its moral side. The guarantee for the unchanging character of truth and the objective existence of distinctions between right and wrong rests upon the impossibility of the Divine nature being mutable. To impair the doctrine of the Church or the Sacraments, of the Atonement or the Incarnation, is less perilous than to impair the doctrine of God. We can think of no error likely, in its ultimate effects, to do more injury to the Christian faith and the Christian morality, for the defence of which Canon Gore would account no personal sacrifice too great, than an error, as we cannot but consider it, which infringes the peculiar glory of the Most High Himself.

Our chief fear is twofold. The unsettlement of popular thought by teaching of this kind coming from such a source is disastrous enough. The rise of a young school of theologians, claiming the name of Catholic, without the balance or the grip on the central verities which marked the Tractarian theology, would be still more disastrous. We would appeal to those students who, with ripening powers and growing knowledge, are still choosing their sides in the great issues of life, to think well before they accept theories which may lead them to a negation of vital truths of the Being of God.

## ART. III.—DEUTERONOMY AND THE 'HIGHER CRITICISM.'

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. By the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (Edinburgh, 1895.)

THE promoters of the *International Critical Commentary* were rightly reckoned to be happy in their first choice of commentator and book. Since the death of Prof. Robertson Smith,

Prof. of the tion v recom does 1 patror the O minde first of Old T fellow histori the se library much Deute the m sufficie even i or nea Prof. I He re the lit literar Testa signifi feeling study of the

1896

As nomy many Englis under rather attrace matica Hebre schola Hebre and frin and frin

Prof.

Testa

Prof. Driver must be regarded as the ablest representative of the critical school in England. He is also, by the moderation with which he states his case, specially well fitted to recommend extreme conclusions to general acceptance. He does not, like some of his school, by using the language of patronage or contempt in regard to the books or teaching of the Old Testament, give gratuitous offence to religiously minded persons. And, again, the advantages of commentating first on Deuteronomy were immense. There is no book of the Old Testament which has had such a general influence on its fellows. The spirit of Deuteronomy is the spirit of the Jewish historian. When it is proved to be in substance a work of the seventh century B.C. it will follow as a consequence that the library of the Jewish Church contained no volume complete much before the Babylonian exile. If, on the other hand, Deuteronomy can be claimed for Moses, he had the share in the making of Israel assigned to him by tradition, and no sufficient reason exists for denying to the historical books, even in their present form, the character of contemporaneous or nearly contemporaneous records. It may be added that Prof. Driver is fully conscious of the importance of his subject. He remarks that 'Deuteronomy stands out conspicuously in the literature of the Old Testament: it has important relations, literary, theological, and historical, with other parts of the Old Testament; it possesses itself a profound moral and spiritual significance; it is an epoch-making expression of the life and feeling of the prophetic nation' (Pref. p. xi). And, again, 'the study of Deuteronomy carries the reader into the very heart of the critical problems which arise in connexion with the Old Testament ' (p. xii).

As Prof. Driver observes, 'a commentary [on Deuteronomy] which may render even approximate justice to its many-sided contents has for long been a desideratum in English theological literature' (Pref. p. xi). Nevertheless, under present circumstances, it is inevitable that the critical rather than the exegetical part of Prof. Driver's work should attract particular attention. Deuteronomy presents few grammatical or linguistic difficulties to the commentator. Its Hebrew is easy and flowing. In the volume before us the scholar will find valuable notes on the exact meaning of Hebrew words or constructions. The general reader will find numerous illustrations of the contents from parallel passages, and from the works written by travellers in the Holy Land in ancient and modern times. But it is not for these things Prof. Driver's book will be studied. We want to know what

į

Jan.

be

l'ord

don

idea

ient,

man

g of

ved.

ttri-

will The

ob-

rests

able.

s, of n to

kely, faith

anon

n an

uliar

pular

ource

theo-

ce or

arian

ppeal

wing

ies of

lead

HER

By

or of Edin-

were

men-

Ian.

Deuteronomy is. We cannot know what it is unless we can identify the circumstances and the age in which it was written. It is no matter of indifference from a religious point of view whether it is the real or the imaginary Moses who is speaking to us in its pages. Prof. Driver tells us that 'the stage which Deuteronomy marks in the Divine education of the chosen people is not that of Moses, but a later age' (Pref. pp. xii, xiii). He takes great pains to assure us that we lose nothing of religious importance thereby. We turn to his Commentary, expecting to find the reasons for this conclusion stated in

their fullest force.

It is important at the outset to define the exact point at issue in regard to Deuteronomy between the critical and traditional schools. We use these names for the sake of convenience, and in default of better; but it must be remembered there are traditionalists who, after frankly using critical methods, refuse their assent to critical conclusions. In regard to Deuteronomy, no traditionalist denies that it received its final shape from a writer later than Moses; and, on the other hand, every critic admits that Deuteronomy contains some small residuum of genuine Mosaic material. The real question is, What is Deuteronomy in substance and spirit? Mosaic? Or is it—and there is only one alternative which seems worth consideration—the work of the seventh century B.C.? Some, at least, of the traditional school do not care to deny that the Mosaic materials may have owed much of their final form to later editors. They feel that it is impossible to say what processes the Old Testament books may not have passed through in the course of those hundreds of years during which their literary history is a blank. It may be Deuteronomy was put into form, popularized, if we may so say, by some unknown writer in the seventh century. Form is one thing, substance is another. The traditional and critical schools join issue in regard to the historical facts, legislation, and religious teaching of Deuteronomy. The one says they are, the other says they are not, substantially Mosaic.

Prof. Driver, it is unnecessary to say, has come to the critical conclusion. There are, indeed, passages from which one might imagine that he met the traditional school more

than half way:

'What is essentially new in Dt, is not the *matter*, but the *form*.

"Dt," says Dillmann truly, "is anything but an original law-book."

The laws which agree with those of the Book of the Covenant can be demonstrated to be old: those which agree with H (Lev. xvii.—xxvi.) have the presumption of being based upon some common older

The either from estal press new principle prob

1896

And esse aner propilegis

any

of I 'Mo he re laws cent book which posi 'par this a bo cere

which it ear and age. Mos contingrad Deu the givin word

nexi

matu Mose an.

an

en.

ew

ing

ich

sen

xii,

ing

ry,

in

at

ra-

ve-

red ical

ard

its

her

me

cion

s it

nich

ury

e to

heir

e to

nave

ears

be

y so

orm

and

acts,

one

saic.

the

hich

nore

form. ook."

in be

(xvi.) older source; the priestly usages alluded to are evidently not innovations. The laws peculiar to Dt have with very few exceptions the appearance either of being taken directly, with unessential modifications of form, from older law-books, or else of being accepted applications of longestablished principles, or the formulations of ancient customs, expressed in Deuteronomic phraseology. And such laws as are really new in Dt, are but the logical and consistent development of Mosaic Even the law for the centralization of worship, it is probable, is only relatively an innovation' (p. lvi).

And, again, the author's position 'towards the Code is thus essentially subordinate; he is not an originator, but expounds anew old principles. Deuteronomy may be described as the prophetic reformulation, and adaptation to new needs, of an older

legislation' (p. lxi).

It must not, however, be imagined that Prof. Driver goes any considerable way towards admitting the Mosaic character of Deuteronomy. Whilst acknowledging the existence of a 'Mosaic nucleus,' he does not define in what it consists, and he must reckon it to be very small. Though many of the laws of Deuteronomy may be much older than the seventh century B.C., they are not so early as Moses. The whole book is dependent on, and consequently later than, I.E. which he tells us 'there are the strongest reasons for supposing to be long subsequent to Moses' (p. xlii). Besides, the parenetic setting' (p. lxi) in Deuteronomy is new, and it is this setting which gives it permanent value by making it a book of general and spiritual rather than of partial and ceremonial religion.

Prof. Driver regards Deuteronomy as having close connexions with all the six or seven centuries of Israel's history which elapsed between Moses and Josiah. There is much in it earlier than the seventh century. There is an undefined and small, yet important, element which belongs to the Mosaic age. It was the seventh century which gave it spirit and form, Moses gave it first principles, all the intervening centuries contributed some items of laws and facts. Like a snowball, gradually, and by accretion from without, the materials of Deuteronomy were gathered together. The man who made the first small beginnings of the work had the honour of giving to the whole his name. To use Prof. Driver's own

words:

'The Mosaic nucleus was expanded and developed in various directions, as national life became more complex, and religious ideas matured. Nevertheless, all Hebrew laws are formulated under Moses' name, a fact which shows that there was a continuous Mosaic tradition, embracing a moral, a ceremonial, and a civil element. The new laws or extensions of old laws . . . were accommodated to this tradition, and incorporated into it' (p. lvii).

The theory that the Mosaic code of laws grew into completeness, and was not born full-grown, seems at first sight attractive and truth-like. Our English experience makes us familiar with the idea. The drawing up of new codes, and even the codification of old laws, have been distasteful to us. Our laws are the outcome of our history: they have been modified and developed to supply our changing and growing needs. There is, however, a necessary consequence of such a genesis of a legal code. The laws reflect back the historical circumstances, and the history explains the laws. Now there is no such relation between Deuteronomy and the history of The earlier national histories should have been mines Israel. of illustration for Prof. Driver in his Commentary. He finds little or nothing to serve his purpose. He should have been able again and again to place laws and institutions in their historical setting. He can do nothing of the sort. Allusions to post-Mosaic history are conspicuous by their absence from Deuteronomy. Why is this? He says: 'From the nature of the case an exhortation placed in Moses' mouth could not be expected to contain allusions to the special circumstances of Manasseh's or of Josiah's reign' (p. liv). On the same principle, allusions to any post-Mosaic period cannot be expected, and as a matter of fact they are not to be found. But it is unnatural to suppose there were no such allusions in the mass of materials—the legislation of six centuries—with which the Deuteronomist had to deal. Were there no explicit references in this to the 'judges,' prophets, kings, royal officials, commerce by land or sea, foreign relations &c. of Israel's later history? Was it an essential part of the editor's work to tear the laws from their historical setting, to eliminate all references to post-Mosaic history, and in so doing to deprive them of most of their meaning and practical force? Is this Prof. Driver's meaning when he speaks of 'new laws &c. being accommodated to a continuous Mosaic tradition'? This at least we are entitled to say: The final result of the seventhcentury editorship was to destroy the connecting links between the Deuteronomic code and the history of Israel, which must have existed at one time. The Deuteronomist thus avoids literary blemishes, but it was a heavy price to pay for the use of Moses' name.

Prof. Driver, it should be noticed, does not put forth this theory of a constant expansion and development of a Mosaic nucle to a cour thesi grea invo

1896

Hebrito idextension origin to M pract
Thee sufficients
As of

mak

aski

and theo stro tells com into in th facts com a pi its la tions once not rials bou anac laws pora

of I

us a

nucleus, and habitual incorporation of new laws into the old, to account for what we find in Deuteronomy. This, of course, might furnish a sufficient justification for his hypothesis. He does it—and does it, which seems to us of the greatest importance, *explicitly*—to obviate the difficulties involved in his own theory. He says:

'Those who concede the existence of such a practice, on the part of Hebrew legislators, will find it remove difficulties which the critical theory of Deuteronomy may otherwise present.\(^1\) If it was the habit thus to identify the stream with the source, and to connect old laws, extended or modified, or even new laws, with the name of the original lawgiver, then the attribution of the laws in Deuteronomy to Moses ceases to be a proceeding out of harmony with the ideas and practices of the Hebrew nation' (p. lvii).

Theories are justified according as, and so far as, they give a sufficient explanation to a number of facts. They are valueless when devised for the removal of self-created difficulties. As opponents of the critical theory we cannot be expected to make the concession Prof. Driver suggests. He is, indeed, asking us to admit the very point he has got to prove.

The want of tangible connexion between Deuteronomy and the history of Israel seems to us to be fatal to the critical theory of its composition. It is, however, exposed to a still stronger objection. Deuteronomy is dependent, Prof. Driver tells us, on JE for its facts. JE is, we must remember, a combination of two different documents, J and E, which cast into a literary form the national traditions (of various dates) in the early centuries of the monarchy.2 Thus, the historical facts of Deuteronomy, like its laws, are of various dates and come from different sources. In consequence, it is throughout a piece of patchwork, its earliest parts 600 years earlier than It is a combination of written records and traditions of different lines of succession. A huge difficulty at once arises which Prof. Driver, we make bold to say, does not attempt to meet. How could these heterogeneous materials have been worked up into a harmonious whole? No bounds can be placed to the resulting inconsistencies and anachronisms when men attempt to combine together the laws and teachings of different ages and schools, contemporaneous records in writing and later traditions.

Sir William Muir, in his little tract on the 'Authorship of Deuteronomy,' published by the S.P.C.K., has drawn for us an instructive historical parallel from the history of Islam.

n. ne

is

1-

nt

is

S.

n

g

a

al

re

of es

ds

ir

ns m

re

es n-

ed.

is

SS

he

es

mer

ar

es

of

of.

ng

at th-

en

ust ids

he

his

aic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The italics are ours.

<sup>2</sup> Driver, Literature of the Old Testament, p. 110.

18

ag

its

ut

Pi

cu

sit

W

ca

ha

on

pr

th

TI

sp

is ob

to

in

do

'p

W

na

of

te

st

st

tra

in

th

th

an

ce

m

ne

CO

pa

m

ha

an

In that history the conditions for the faithful transmission of oral traditions were the most favourable that can be imagined. Contemporary documents record the facts relating to the rise of Mohammedanism as related at first hand by unexceptionable witnesses—the Prophet's widows and companions. Here is a check on the vagaries of tradition which Israel, according to the critics, did not possess. Nevertheless,

'before the lapse of many generations such wide divergences, discordant tales, and supernatural colouring, affected the subject-matter of tradition that, without the contemporaneous records referred to, it would often have been impossible to distinguish fact from fiction, the true from the false, the real from the mere imaginary' (p. 9). 'Long before two centuries had elapsed the story had wandered into a thousand channels; the supernatural had given birth to the wildest extravagances, and fugitive evidence had begun to fade into a haze of certainty' (p. 9).

The analogy between Islam and the religion of Israel is close. The Hebrews and the Arabs are cognate races. The subject-matter of the two traditions-law, history, and religious teaching mingled—is identical. Solid advantages are on the Mohammedan side: a higher civilization; a shorter period-200 years instead of 600-for the introduction of corruptions; contemporaneous documents beyond the influence of the traditions. And yet, who could say that Deuteronomy resembles in the slightest degree the picture of Moslem tradition given by Sir William Muir? Discrepancies and difficulties we do not deny, but they do not affect the harmony and clearness of the general results. We have no pure Mosaic records, the critics tell us, to fall back upon, but simply such reminiscences as passed down from lip to lip, and so it should have been impossible—we are adapting Sir William Muir's words (p. 13)-after a few generations to have framed from them any consistent lifelike picture of the Prophet (Moses), or, indeed, any clear picture at all. But it is certain we have a life-like picture in The picture is further self-consistent as a Deuteronomy. whole.1 Though the Moses of Deuteronomy be a man born out of due time, he is a man for all that, and the outlines of his picture are clear and distinct. Nor can it be denied that Deuteronomy is composed as a book which is at unity in itself. The critics tell us it is inconsistent with the circumstances of the Mosaic age. We reply, Your statement is incapable of proof; but, if it is, as you assert, the product of different

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Sir William Muir speaks of Deuteronomy's 'inimitable naturalness' (p. 32). Also cf. pp. 19-26 of his tract.

ages, it must have been, which it is not, inconsistent with itself. Such being the case, we summarily sweep aside as utterly insufficient a large number of the arguments on which Prof. Driver relies. When he has alleged some real difficulties and some small anachronisms, he has hardly taken a single step towards proving his point. We answer, in a word, Whether there is anything in the points you allege we care not. This is certain: if your theory is true, you would

have had infinitely more to say.

We lay the greater stress on this argument because it is one to which the critics are bound, if they are true to their principles, to give due weight. When we say, On your theory the Old Testament history is not true; they reply, Though not true, it is none the less valuable as a vehicle for spiritual teaching. But Old Testament history, if not true, is undeniably clear, vivid, marvellously free from gross and obvious blunders and anachronisms. Prima facie it hangs together. You have to search very carefully to find any inconsistency. It would be a miracle if, in such very ancient documents, there were not some. Prof. Ryle's theory of 'practised storytellers' and Prof. Cheyne's 'fine imagination' would account for the brightness and vividness of isolated narratives, but not for their harmonious weaving together. Historical accuracy—we do not mean truth, but the absence of inconsistencies and anachronisms-is the last thing storytellers trouble themselves about. We repeat, the critics have still to set themselves to meet the 'traditional' case in its How accommodating that 'continuous Mosaic strength. tradition' must have been to which the new laws of six centuries, with their diversities of experiences and ideas and institutions, were successively accommodated! Israel's wineskins, it appears, never became old; they never burst with this continuous pouring in of new wine.

We have hitherto been mainly dealing with Prof. Driver's theory of the collection of the materials of Deuteronomy—the ancient materials which the unknown author of the seventh century found ready to his hand. But we must bear in mind that what the Professor calls 'the parenetic setting' is new—the author's very own. This parenetic setting is very considerable and very important. It would include the passages on which the permanent value of Deuteronomy mainly consists: for instance the Shema (p. liii). We need hardly say that this setting, though new, is put definitely and directly and repeatedly into Moses' mouth. How is this explained? The theories of a legal fiction, or continuous

1890

aut

(p.

WO

the

poi Mo

the

non

Or,

it w

den

he

the

fect

aut

leve

the

they

tion

Mo:

Wh

wou

to n

side to

pret

Driv non

of ]

as a

so fa

The a h

whil

cusa

mad

be e

exp

Mosaic tradition, no longer apply. Deuteronomy, we are told, is merely an example upon an extended scale of the practice of inserting into narratives speeches simply giving imaginative expression to thoughts or feelings appropriate to the character and occasion to which they are referred, which has many and admirable precedents in the literature of the world (p. lviii). A little further on, 'the dialogues of Plato, the epic of Dante, the tragedies of Shakespeare, the *Paradise Lost*, and even the poem of Job' are given as illustrations of this practice:

'The author in each case having a message to deliver, or a lesson to teach, placed it in the mouth of the person to whose character it was appropriate, or whose personality would give it force, and so presented it to the world. *Mutatis mutandis*, the procedure of the Deuteronomist was similar' (p. lviii).

We have now fully before us Prof. Driver's elaborate attempt to explain how it is that Deuteronomy, not being Mosaic, is definitely and repeatedly ascribed to Moses. Generally speaking the authority of an Old Testament Book is unconnected with its authorship. The writer does not ordinarily speak in his own name. But in Deuteronomy Moses is everywhere—the centre and circumference—the speaker and the subject of the discourse. The author—we do not mean the final editor-though not Moses, made an unbounded use of Moses' name. Prof. Driver tries hard to show that this unbounded use was not unjustifiable—to eliminate, in other words, the taint of false pretence out of the critical Deuteronomy. He cannot do it. Being essentially non-Mosaic, the book makes great efforts in various ways to seem Mosaic. Old Testament authors are wont to hide their own personality; this author takes special pains to obtrude a personality which is not his own. He was simply developing principles of which Moses would have approved, pleads Prof. Driver (p. lix). But would a letter of exhortation to a son purporting untruly to come from his father be anything less of a false pretence because the principles and motives laid down were such as the father approved? Would anyone doing this assume no unjustifiable liberty and make no unfair use of the father's name? (pp. lviii, lix). Prof. Driver says, 'It will be apparent how little foundation there is for the objection . . . that if the critical view of Deuteronomy is correct, the book is a "forgery," the author of which sought to shelter himself under a great name' (p. lxi). It is not apparent to us, and Prof. Driver is simply contending for words. The

XUM

1896

e

o h

e

),

ie

of

n

it

0

ie

e

k

ot

y

e

0

1-

W

n

al

1-

m

n

a

g

f.

r-

a

m

ıg

se

Ιt

C-

t,

er

to

ne

author does not 'forge,' but 'he places Moses on the stage' (p. lviii). He does not 'shelter himself under a great name,' but he puts his teaching in the mouth of the man 'whose personality would give it force '(ib.). This somewhat reminds us of 'Convey the wise it call.' Prof. Driver is evidently uneasy at this point in his argument. He repeats again and again that Moses' name was not used in any improper way. But if there was nothing wrong, why should he remark that 'Hilkiah need have known nothing about 'the composition of Deuteronomy? (p. lv). Was, then, that knowledge a guilty secret? Or, again, what is the object of adding that 'his discovery of it would then have been (as it purports to be) purely accidental'? Would he have transgressed the rules of morality if he had taken it from the author's hand and presented it to the king? If the composition of Deuteronomy was perfectly innocent, such also must have been its publication. And, again, if false pretence was not an essential point in its author's modus operandi, the very fulcrum without which his lever could not work at all, why could not 'an exhortation placed in Moses' mouth be expected to contain allusions to the special circumstances either of Manasseh's or Josiah's reign'? (p. liv). Were there some Jews who would object, if they knew the true state of the case, to this last 'accommodation' to Mosaic tradition and this extensive 'development' of Mosaic principles, and whom it was advisable to deceive? What seems clear is that the author, with his practical object, would never have sacrificed force, and point, and usefulness to mere literary form. He sacrificed them for what he considered an equivalent—the power without gross inconsistency to use Moses' name. How does this differ from a false pretence?

We thus attach no value to those phrases in which Prof. Driver veils the immorality involved in the critical Deuteronomy. We cannot regard the dialogues of Plato, the epic of Dante, the tragedies of Shakespeare, the *Paradise Lost*, as analogous cases. We are willing to admit that we find in the Bible speeches which must be regarded as compositions, so far as the literary form is concerned, of the Biblical writers. The record, we may reasonably suppose, provided a text or a hint which they expanded into a speech or discourse. But whilst some expansions are unexceptionable and some excusable, there are limits beyond which they cannot be honestly made. You cannot argue because a single thought may be expanded lawfully into a few verses, that it may be further expanded into many chapters of legislation and exhorta-

tion.¹ The fundamental principles of Deuteronomy—viz. that Jehovah is Israel's only God, who tolerated no other God beside Him, and claimed to be the sole object of the Israelites' allegiance—are, we are told, Mosaic (p. lix). 'All that belongs to the post-Mosaic author is the rhetorical form in which they are presented' (ib.). This we maintain to be an illegitimate, and immoral, and unjustifiable expansion. The comment or sermon cannot be legitimately ascribed to the author who supplies the text. The Higher Criticism hardly gives sufficient authority to the claims of the higher morality. And, though some critics deny it, the morality of the inspired prophets and teachers of the Old Covenant was of the higher sort.

The date of the finding of the Book of the Law in the Temple—i.e. 621 B.C.—is the latest possible date to which Deuteronomy can be assigned. It is more difficult, Prof. Driver thinks, to say how much earlier it may be. He gives ten reasons which 'tend to fix its date more closely, and to show that it belongs, most probably, either to the reign of Manasseh or to the early years of the reign of Josiah' (p. xlvi). At the risk of tediousness let us see what they are worth.

Reason (1) is the difference between the laws of Deuteronomy and those of Exodus xxi.-xxiii., indicating a material development in Israel's social and political organizations, and pointing to a considerable interval of time, between the two Codes.

We object to the use of the word 'Code' in regard to Exodus xxi.—xxiii. It is a mere fragment which could never have been 'adequate to the nation's needs.' It is a number of directions unsystematically put together on different points of duty for the use of the people (Exodus xxi. 1). It does not deal with 'organizations' at all. Its elementary character may be regarded as indicating its simple purpose, not its early date.

But are any indications of a late date to be found in the Deuteronomic laws? Prof. Driver relies (note p. xlvi) upon Prof. Cheyne for his proofs here, and we wonder whether he verified his references. The latter says (*Jeremiah*, p. 71): 'The Israel of Dt is separated from the Israel of the Exodus by a complete social revolution. The nomad tribes have grown into a settled and wealthy community <sup>2</sup> [notice the phrase 'the

elder

no lo most settle 'elde of of cities of Je ludg Prof. in D the I ness ( (chap all, of chap. brews treatr of a s lendir bill o mand borate much in the xxi.) t double Cheyr warlik Deute but fr

directi

in the

mais c

your s

sert th

off the

forbid

VOL.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Whatever view we take of the Book of Job, the *dramatis personæ* are names and nothing more.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> There are few signs of wealth, and it is of a primitive kind; and the settlement has yet to be made.

siege.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Gi <sup>3</sup> Wi this? V ancient

elders of the city,' xix. 12, &c.] whose organization needs no longer to be constituted, but only to be reformed.' most telling proof of the 'complete social revolution,' 'the settled and wealthy community,' thus appears to be the phrase 'elders of the city.' And yet the 'elder' is the most ancient of officers. Israel had 'elders' in Egypt, and she dwelt in cities there. She was, when Moses spoke, dwelling in cities east of Jordan. Elders of various cities are mentioned in the Judges. What proof is there here of a seventh-century date? Prof. Cheyne goes on to admit that there are primitive laws in Deuteronomy; 'but the elaborate character of most of the Deuteronomic arrangements conclusively proves the lateness of their origin. See, for instance, the laws of contracts (chaps. xv., xxiii., xxiv.), of inheritance (chap. xxi.), and, above all, of war (chap. xx.).' Verifying our references, we find that chap. xv. commands the release of debts and slaves (Hebrews only) in the Sabbatical years, exhorts to generous treatment of the debtor and slave, and provides for the case of a servant refusing to leave his master. Chap. xxiii. forbids lending upon usury to 'thy brother.' Chap. xxiv. orders a bill of divorcement, regulates lending on pledge, and commands the daily payment of wages. So much for the 'elaborate character' of 'the laws of contracts' which, it is not too much to say, are unsuited for a commercial nation like Israel in the seventh century.1 In regard to 'inheritance' (chap. xxi.) the only provision is, that the first-born shall not lose his double portion when he is the son of a hated wife. Cheyne says 'above all, war (chap. xx.),' and yet there is no warlike organization worthy of the name. It is plain the Deuteronomist does not regard war from the practical soldier's, but from the religious teacher's, point of view, and issues directions which could never have been carried out except in the earliest periods of Israel's history. 'C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre,' to issue proclamations inviting your soldiers, when they 'come nigh unto the battle,' to desert their standards on various pretexts, and go home; 2 to put off the choice of a leader to the same critical moment; 3 and to forbid the cutting down of fruit trees even in a protracted siege. Prof. Cheyne bids us contrast these 'elaborate' provisions with Numbers xxxi. 25-30, which, as far as we can see,

an.

nat

bo

es'

nat

in

an

he

the

dly

ity.

red

her

the

rof.

ives

d to

of

lvi).

eroerial

and

two

d to

ever

nber

oints

not

acter

t its

n the

upon

er he

The

by a

rown

'the

rsonæ

; and

Commerce involves, necessarily, 'lending on usury.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Gideon does this, Judges vii.

<sup>3</sup> What would Joab, or any of Israel's captains of the hosts, say to this? Why does the Deuteronomist ignore the existence of such an ancient office as 'captain of the host'?

VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

deals not with war, but with the division of booty. It is only fair to Prof. Driver that he has discovered the untrustworthiness of his authority on 'above all, war.' He says elsewhere (p. lxi): 'The law of military service implies a simpler state of society than the age of the later kings. The author of Deuteronomy has merely cast into his own phraseology some old usages which had perhaps been allowed to fall into neglect.' 'Perhaps'! Prof. Driver is too cautious. Why should the Deuteronomist, a practical man, have taken the trouble to recast these obsolete usages? And how does anything alleged under this head tend to fix the date of Deuteronomy to the reigns of Manasseh or Josiah?

Reason (2) is 'The Law of the kingdom is coloured by

reminiscences of the monarchy of Solomon.'

If so, still we are not landed in the seventh century B.C. Some reminiscences of other notorious monarchs might have been expected at that time. There seems to us nothing in the law which Moses' experience of the temptations which assailed all Eastern kings might not have suggested to him. We may quote Prof. Driver himself with regard to its aim: 'The king is not, in his court-establishment, to imitate the great despots of the East '(p. 209). But whether Mosaic or not, the law is not adapted to the seventh century, or to any of the centuries in which kings reigned over Israel. When there is a king, he is always the centre of Israel's life, civil and religious. the head of both the Jewish State and Jewish Church. In Deuteronomy he is a possibility of a future age, an institution which may take its place along with Israel's existing institutions-priests, judges, elders, &c.-but may not. He is not regarded as an institution which controls, and in some sense absorbs them all.\(^1\) So he is regarded ideally, unpractically, and præ-historically, in a word Mosaically. It would be absolutely impossible, we think, for an author (seventh century B.C.) thus to dissociate himself from the facts of his experience, and to imagine himself into Moses' position. Was he, we ask again, a literary artist or a practical politician?<sup>2</sup>

Reason (3) is based on 'the mixed supreme tribunals of xvii. 8-13, which seem to be already established, and to presuppose the existence of the judicature, instituted according

to 2 Chronicles xix, 8-11 by Jehoshaphat.'

Bool their It is was: an o the o F

1896

the v date ledge in Ca As a Israe Mosa threa

into

Deut

again

Prof.

worsh Deut Mosa R Deute Jeren certai

W

of res are fe Let u proph What ble in the au that h for rea But w High for Jel justice

vocation

materi

Prof. Driver sees this (pp. 209-10).
 Cf. on this law an article by Dr. Watson, in the Thinker, iii. 396 'The author contrived so skilfully to isolate himself in idea from the national life of his time, that we find no trace of any central power in Deuteronomy.' 'The only centralization known is connected with God's sanctuary.'

The critical school should not play fast and loose with the Book of Chronicles, now denying it the slightest weight against their own hypotheses, now using it to discredit earlier books. It is straining the passage quoted to say that Jehoshaphat was instituting a new tribunal; he may have been administering an old law. Mixed tribunals might have been established in the desert.

Reason (4). The forms of idolatry alluded to, especially the worship of the Host of heaven (iv. 19, xvii. 3), point to a

date not earlier than 750 B.C.

Jan.

only

orthi-

vhere

state

or of

some

into

Why

n the

does

ate of

ed by

y B.C. t have

in the

ssailed

e may

e king

lespots

v is not

ries in g, he is

He is

ch. In

titution

institu-

is not

e sense

ould be th cen-

of his

n. Was

inals of

to pre-

; iii. 396idea from

power in ith God's

ian?2

'Worship of the sun and moon,' Prof. Driver acknow-ledges, 'was ancient, as is attested even by the names of places in Canaan' (p. xlvi). It must have been known to Moses. As a Canaanitish practice, it was natural for him to warn Israel against it. The warning given is delivered from the Mosaic, not from the seventh-century, standpoint. Danger threatens, but it is not alleged that there has been falling into this particular sin.' We may ask here how it was the Deuteronomist (seventh century B.C.) had no word to speak against the national sin from time immemorial—Baal worship or Prof. Driver remarks under this head that 'the temptation to worship other gods is the pressing danger of the age both in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.' Yes, we reply, and also in the Mosaic and in other times.

Reason (5) is derived from the different relations between Deuteronomy and (1) the eighth-century prophets, and (2) Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah; in the one case un-

certain, in the other close and evident.

We are inclined to admit the facts as stated. The points of resemblance between Amos, Hosea, &c., and Deuteronomy are few; those between Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, many. Let us assume that Deuteronomy was written between the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, then the question arises, What traces of the influence of the earlier prophets are discernible in Deuteronomy? Prof. Driver says: 'It will be seen that the author builds upon the foundation of the prophets, and that his primary aim is to create an effectual moral stimulus for realizing the ideals which they had propounded ' (p. xxvii). But when he goes into details he alleges nothing distinctive. High conceptions of life and duty, moral obedience a requisite for Jehovah's favour, the paramount claims of civil and social justice, 'the old truth of Exodus xix. 6, that it was Israel's vocation to be a holy nation,' the connexion of moral and material deterioration with the forsaking of Jehovah—these

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the word 'lest' in iv. 19.

are not doctrines so peculiar to the canonical prophets that the Israelite who teaches them must be assumed to build on their foundation. Moreover, can a teacher who attaches so much importance to outward rites and ceremonies be said to build on the foundation of men who always speak of them disparagingly? 'The author of Deuteronomy is the spiritual heir of Hosea' (p. xxvii), says Prof. Driver. If so, how is it that he did not teach Hosea's doctrine that Israel is Jehovah's unfaithful wife? The Deuteronomist does not, like Hosea, call to repentance, and yet the need in the seventh century was most urgent. If it was from Isaiah he derived 'the old truth' that Israel was called to be a holy nation, how is it that he never calls God by Isaiah's distinctive name, 'The Holy One of Israel'? The Messianic idea, so prominent in Isaiah and Micah, is absent from Deuteronomy. Israel is represented as just about to take possession of her promised land, and she needed no promise of a deliverer to arise in the latter days.2 It is admitted there is no conception of a worldwide kingdom. 'In its attitude towards other nations, Dt shows considerable exclusiveness and particularism '(p. xxxi). The sins which the prophets specially denounce, oppression of the poor by the rich, unjust judgment, and the like, have no particular mention in Deuteronomy, and yet we know Manasseh filled Jerusalem with innocent blood. The political outlook is not that of the canonical prophets or of their time. Assyria is not visible, and Egypt and other nations are regarded from the Mosaic standpoint. There is no warning (though much needed) against entanglement in foreign alliances. It is strange, no doubt, that we cannot find more certain traces of the influence of Deuteronomy on the earlier prophets, but the critics must explain why Israel's history generally, and the prophecies of the eighth century B.C., have left no certain traces on Deuteronomy before they can draw any conclusions as to date.3

Reason (6) is based on the language and style of Deuteronomy, which is thought not to belong to the first age of Hebrew literature. If a later editor worked up Mosaic materials, this (if true) would be accounted for. This reason has, however, the fatal defect of involving a previous acceptance of the critical conclusions. We must determine the dates of the

<sup>1</sup> The prophetic name for God, Jehovah Sabaoth, is absent also. <sup>2</sup> If this representation was not real, Deuteronomy lost something of

Penta early much sectio Deut ratur (thou of H showi

think

very (

1896

R theolo of the found wante that I quent on wh as tha Re

up of

(xix. of Eg differe and so the br on the The L either Asher that h heathe Assign the dif Old T builds which

Re an age

Jen Ex 3 W

the pilla not to th

its practical value; Israel needed a deliverer in the seventh century B.C. See further on this point Dr. Watson's Article in the Thinker, already quoted (p. 303).

Pentateuch, &c., before we can ascertain the characteristics of early or late Hebrew. Prof. Driver cannot, we think, attach much importance to this argument; for he tells us that the sections in J E, parenetic in tone, approximate in style to Deuteronomy (p. lxxvii). Also in his Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (p. 473), he ranks Deuteronomy (though of a different type) with the finest and best examples of Hebrew prose-J E, &c., and regards Jeremiah, &c., as showing slight signs of being later in date. We ourselves think that the styles of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy differ very considerably. Apparently Prof. Cheyne does the same.1

Reason (7). 'The prophetic teaching of Dt, the dominant theological ideas, &c., presuppose a relatively advanced stage of theological reflexion, as they also approximate to what is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel' (p. xlvii). Particulars are wanted here. We shall give, later on, reasons for thinking that Moses was in advance of the men of his own and subsequent generations. But we have already noticed particulars on which the teaching of Deuteronomy was not so far advanced as that of the canonical prophets of the eighth century B.C.

Reason (8). Deuteronomy xvi. 22, which forbids the setting up of a pillar or obelisk, cannot have been known to Isaiah (xix. 19), who adopted it as a symbol of the future conversion of Egypt to the true faith. It seems quite plain that there are different kinds of pillars in the Old Testament, some lawful and some unlawful. The Book of the Covenant commands the breaking down of Canaanitish pillars.<sup>2</sup> Exodus xxiv. 4, on the other hand, records how Moses set up twelve pillars. The Law in Deuteronomy xvi. 21, 22, forbids the erection of either an Asherah or a pillar near the altar of Jehovah. Asherah being necessarily a heathen image, we may assume that here a heathenish pillar is alluded to.3 The same two heathen symbols are placed side by side in Exodus xxxiv. 15. Assignment of a late date to Deuteronomy will not remove the difficulty arising from the disagreement on this point of Old Testament teachers. How is it that Deuteronomy, if it builds on Isaiah's foundation, prohibits a religious symbol which he adopted as suitable and suggestive?

Reason (9). 'The Law of Dt xviii. 20-22 presupposes an age in which . . . it became necessary to supply Israel

Jan.

s that

ld on

es so

aid to

them

iritual

, how

ael is

t, like

venth

erived

n, how

, 'The

ent in

ael is

mised

in the

world-

is, Dt

xxxi).

ession

, have

know

olitical

r time.

are re-

arning

oreign

l more

earlier

nistory

., have

n draw

f Deu-

age of

mate-

on has,

ance of

of the

thing of ury B.C.

already

lso.

Jeremiah, p. 82.

Exodus xxiii. 24; so also Exodus xxxiv. 15.
 We may notice here in opposition to Prof. Driver, note p. xlvii, that the pillar of Deuteronomy xvi. 22 is parallel to the Asherah of xvi. 21 a, not to the altar of xvi. 21 b.

Jan.

with the means of distinguishing between true and false prophets, *i.e.* the period from the eighth century onwards' (p. xlviii).

False prophets were numerous long before the eighth century. It would not be unfair to say that the true prophet implied the false. The tests given are very simple. The utter fallacy of seeing in this law indications of a late date will be apparent when we observe that it simply puts into a general form principles which were carried out at Moses' mission to Israel in Egypt (Exodus iii. 12, iv. 1, &c.). If the narrative of this mission (JE) is historical, then the law was natural in Moses' mouth. If it is not, then, on critical principles, it embodies in narrative form a custom common in Israel during the early days of the monarchy. In neither case are we brought near to a seventh-century date.

Reason (10) adds nothing new to those which have gone before. It is stated in general terms, and is unsupported by particular instances. It is sufficiently met by a direct contradiction.

We cannot hope we have not been tedious in discussing thus minutely these ten reasons, which tend to fix a seventh-century date to Deuteronomy. Our excuse must be that we regard it of paramount importance to bring the public face to face with the evidence for the critical case. With the conclusions they have been long familiar, but the evidence has been kept in the background. We venture to hope that we have done something towards showing how flimsy this evidence is. Critical reasons seem to us remarkably like the witnesses in an election petition, who one by one break down under cross-examination, and utterly fail to substantiate the sweeping statements of counsel's brief.

Prof. Driver's argument is, of course, destructive as well as constructive. It may be, spite of all that has been hitherto said, that he is able to prove Deuteronomy cannot have been in substance the work of Moses.

At the outset it is necessary to make some preliminary inquiry about Moses, his work, his capacity, his special qualifications and advantages. At once we come face to face with the question, Is the description of him which we find in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, historical or imaginary? How are we to regard the statements in Numbers xii. 6-8, that the Divine revelation to Moses surpassed in its clearness and direct-

ness 'The unto feren Thes we w us a will I ment cepti trace The we as tion? Well But 1 not r detai was 1 chara IE. of a be su be sa

1896

conserved exem chara advantaborn him pof Goin the ing else excel whole conte

made

arrive

preced piece o

1 (

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Prof. Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament was an admirable synopsis of critical conclusions; but the reasons, owing to exigencies of space, were given in scanty supply.

false ards'

ighth

Jan.

The date nto a loses' If the was prin-

case gone

conassing enthat we ace to cone has

this te the down te the

herto been inary

pecial of face ind in How at the lirect-

tament

ness that vouchsafed to prophets? or in Exodus xxxiii. 11. 'The Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend'?1 We are told a great deal about the different documents in the Pentateuch, and their final date, &c. These things are, after all, matters of literary curiosity. What we want to know is whether we may accept them as giving us a true idea of the character of the Divine revelation. It will be convenient, for our present purpose, to leave the document P out of our consideration. Deuteronomy, with the exception of a few sentences, shows, in Prof. Driver's opinion, no trace of the influence of P, but is closely dependent on J E.2 The passages we have cited above are found in J E. Do they, we ask, fairly represent the truth about Moses and his revelation? Of course, it would be needless to ask such a question of Wellhausen and Kuenen and some of their English followers. But Prof. Driver differs somewhat from them, and he does not make his position clear. We do not wish to press the details or the imagery of the narrative too closely; but if Moses was not the recipient of a revelation unique in its form and character, the word 'historical' has no meaning in relation to IE. But if I E is not historical, why is it not? The presence of a considerable supernatural element in the narrative would be sufficient answer for some. In regard to others, we cannot be said to show unreasonable suspicion if we ask it should be made clear that their revolutionary conclusions were not arrived at by the way of the hypotheses of unbelief.

Now, if we admit J E to be an historical document, and in consequence admit that Moses was the recipient of a unique revelation, it does not follow we should regard him as exempt from the laws of natural development. The special character of his inspiration, though it would place him in advance of his age, would not make him altogether as one born out of due time. It would, however, necessarily give him power to discern, with a marvellous insight, the meaning of God's dealings, the Divine thoughts which were embodied in the facts of Israel's history. The fire which was smouldering elsewhere would kindle in him, and he would be able to speak with his tongue of things whose knowledge was too excellent to be attained by his generation. Thus, on the whole, our inquiry should not take the form, Did Moses' contemporaries and immediate successors attain a like ad-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Ex. xxxiii. 19, &c., and xxxiv. 6, &c.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See here § 2 of the Preface on the 'Relation of Deuteronomy to the preceding Books of the Pentateuch,' which seems to us an admirable piece of work.

vanced knowledge of Divine truth? It would be unreasonable to expect that they should—they who did not, like him, go up into the mount of God. Rather we should ask, Had he before him the materials from which the doctrines attributed to him might be inferred? If he had, it is not unreasonable to believe that in God's light he saw light.

An analogy from the history of the Christian Church will help us here. 'The Church,' says Bishop Lightfoot, 'needed a long education before she was fitted to be the expositor of the true Apostolic doctrine.' 'The true successors of the Apostles [in regard to doctrine] are not the Fathers of the second, but the Fathers of the third and fourth centuries.' Similarly, it is placed on record by a Jewish writer of the early centuries of the monarchy, 'There hath not risen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses.' We know that he was right. The canonical prophets are Moses' true successors.

There is one leading idea in Deuteronomy which, Prof. Driver (on Deut. vii. 8) remarks, does not occur elsewhere earlier than the prophet Hosea, and belongs to a late period of Jewish theology—viz. the love of God for Israel. Assuming that such is the case, and bearing in mind what we have already said, is this a doctrine which Moses could not have been expected to know and teach? It is no small point of detail with which we are dealing now. We are applying a crucial test. We thoroughly admit that, if Moses could not, according to the laws of religious development, have attained to a knowledge of this truth, Deuteronomy is not Mosaic. We naturally inquire, first, whether the idea is to be found in documents confessed to be earlier in date than Deuteronomy? It is not found in stated terms. And yet in JE we find such abundant materials for forming it that it cannot be regarded as beyond the reach of a man of special spiritual discernment. It is not a far cry from Exodus xix. 4-6, 'Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me among all peoples,' to those words in Deuteronomy (vii. 6, 7) which tell how Jehovah chose Israel to be a peculiar people to Himself, and set His love upon them. He to whom the revelation of the Lord as a God full of compassion and gracious, and plenteous in mercy and truth (Exodus xxxiv. 6, &c.), came should not have found it difficult to conceive and bring to its birth the great truth that Jehovah loved His people love vide Mos Christian nor the state of the state

1896

siste of J that trutl with of t peop expl Bego

with

mar

Jord

past so n force save and rend who its in pres back and tory Mos beer and inse disti man

truth rema conta

<sup>1</sup> Colossians, p. 91.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> J E: the date is Prof. Driver's.

people. Even with still greater clearness could the same love be inferred from those acts of redemption and providential care which never ceased throughout the mission of Moses. He lived as no other Israelite of any age before Christ lived, in the habitual experience of God's love for Israel. His successors had neither his personal experiences nor his spiritual capacities, and so cannot be expected to reach the same altitude. In spiritual things men do not start from the vantage ground won for them by their predecessors.

We would draw special attention to the deep inward consistency between the teaching of Deuteronomy and the records of J E concerning Moses. It is he of whom it is recorded that he had seen God, who is led onwards towards the great truth that God is Love. The New Testament furnishes us with a remarkable parallel. As Deuteronomy, the last book of the Pentateuch, alone declares that Jehovah loved His people, so St. John, the last of the Evangelists, alone teaches explicitly, 'So God loved the world that He gave His Only

Begotten Son.'

Jan.

on-

im, I he

ited

able

will

ded r of

the

the

ies.

the

n a

he

ors. Prof.

here

d of

ning

nave

nt of

not, ined

saic.

ound

JE

nnot

ecial odus

and

unto

leed,

sure

omy

hom

and iv. 6,

and

His

Cogent arguments of a psychological kind connect Moses with Deuteronomy. Book and author correspond very remarkably. When Moses stands on the eastern bank of Jordan at the close of the fortieth year of the wanderings, his past history and present position are unique. He had done so much, and now, though his eye is not dim nor his natural force abated, there is no more that he can do. He who has saved his nation cannot save himself. He is so full of life and yet so near death. Death is to him a double agony; it rends him body and soul, and rends him also from that nation whose very soul he had been for forty years. Deuteronomy, in its interior knowledge of the past and in its masterly grasp of the present situation, in its intensity of feelings, in its rapid glances backwards and forwards, in its mingling of solemn warnings and high hopes, elements personal and elements national, history of the past and legislation for the future; seems to reflect Moses with 'inimitable naturalness.' The past which has been his, the future which is denied him, divide his attention and distract his mind. His nation and himself, hitherto so inseparable—now alas! to be so soon separated—he can hardly distinguish them in his thoughts and words. He is an old man, and there is to be discerned, we think, in his utterances

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> It should also be noticed that consciousness of God's love is a truth which a child in spiritual things might feel whilst a man might remain insensible to it. Note, in illustration, that the later document P contains nothing about the love of God for Israel.

189

(p.

Mo

hai

wri

be

the

bot

tio

Mo

de

La

por

boo

pos

of

tion

Th

to

ima

is t

was

alw

sho

ap

one

of a

the

'sh

whi

con

com

date

revi

prec

deli

The

all.

seni

exp

a p

sim

somewhat of the confusion natural to old age. His mind connects things which time widely separates. He places the earlier and later events of his long life side by side. He mingles, as old men are wont, the descriptions of different events, and words spoken at different times. He has, moreover, just that independence of JE which would be natural to Moses. To differ from one's authority is an error, to differ from one's self is to aim at a closer approximation to the truth. Men are wont to give different reasons for their actions at different times. Moses, being conscious of unrecorded springs of actions, of secret causes underlying those which worked before men's eyes, was not afraid to differ from his own records.¹ A later author dependent on JE for his knowledge of the facts would have followed his authority with

greater exactness. For example, how natural it was for Moses to place his own sentence of exclusion from Canaan immediately after that passed on the generation which came forth from Egypt, although the one belonged to the second, and the other to the thirty-ninth year of the wanderings. He was feeling keenly that, spite of all his faithfulness, his fate was the same as theirs to whom God sware in His wrath that they should not enter into His rest.2 Again, his statement, 'The Lord was angry with me for your sakes,' comes naturally from the mouth of a man who all his life long had been bearing the intolerable burden of his rebellious people. They knew how once he had spoken unadvisedly with his lips; he knew how often bitterness had been repressed. He gives himself a word of vindication. It was your fault, he feels, and feels truly, that I have lost the goodly land. The criticism which sees discrepancy here is somewhat wanting in imagination. The flash of reproachful irritation from one who had been so continuously tried, had so rarely failed, and had been so severely punished for the one failure, is a natural touch which identifies the writer with Moses.3

The difference of style between Deuteronomy and J E is alleged by Prof. Driver as a proof that both cannot have come from Moses, and he quotes Bishop Perowne to the same effect

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For Prof. Driver's proof that he did so differ see p. xviii. We are assuming that Moses supplied the materials of J E.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Prof. Driver (p. xxxvi) sees an argument against the Mosaic authorship here.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Similarly the fact that the writer does not appear fully to realize the length of the interval between the Exodus and arriving at Canaan fits exactly with Moses' position. At the end of his life's work he regards it as a whole.

(p. xii and note). The argument has no force unless we claim Moses as the final author of both. The critics, we think, will hardly take up the untenable position that Moses left no written records behind him. If he did, though we may not be able to trace them, they are almost certainly imbedded in the records which have come down to us. Our theory of both J E and Deuteronomy is, that they are founded on traditions current in Moses' time, and on writings to be traced to Moses himself. The relation between them is not that of dependence the one upon the other, but of common origin. Later Old Testament editors, we know, commonly incorporated their materials in block and verbatim into their books. Probably the earlier editors did the same. The supposition that Moses is the primary but not the final author of both JE and Deuteronomy gives a fair general explanation of both the similarities and differences between them. The thoughts crowding his mind as he gave his last address to Israel would be naturally expressed in the words and imagery he had already used in his records. But—and here is the important point—it is probable, more especially as he was an old man, that the same words and imagery would not always describe the same event. Prof. Driver, on p. xviii, shows that there is a remarkable number of cases in which a phrase originally—i.e. in I E—used in the description of one incident is applied in Deuteronomy to the description of another. He draws, as we think, a wrong inference from

'There are passages in Dt,' says Prof. Driver (p. xlii), 'showing that the author lived at a distance from the period which he describes.' Some of these we have already considered.

'Thus,' he goes on to say, 'if Dt i. 3 ("eleventh month") be compared with Numbers xxxiii. 38 ("fifth month"), which fixes the date of Numbers xx. 22-28, it appears that the whole of the events reviewed in Dt. ii. 2-iii. 29 had taken place during the six months preceding the time when, if Moses be the author, the discourse was delivered.'

The argument, of course, is that too many events are crowded into this short space of time.

Arguments of this kind have, in our opinion, no force at all. They are based on details, single words, or isolated sentences. They demand a degree of accuracy not to be expected in documents of remote antiquity, emanating from a people unchronological in their cast of thought. If numerous similar discrepancies were found, transcription and editing

an.

nd

he

He

ent

re-

ral

ffer

th.

ons

ich

wn

ow-

his

fter

pt,

nly

as

not

the

now

ord uly,

sees

The

on-

rely

ifies E is

ome ffect

e are

osaic

e the

a fits

rds it

189

tha

fac

Na

wh

suc

ter

ad

Isi

tua

thi

do

fai

sta

tra

of

int

yo de

are

pr

ad

sti

pr

au

be

gi

of Si

G

pl

la

"d

wh

th

m

ha

356

miracle if they had not.1 In this case, however, we have a far more serious objection to take to the argument used. How does Prof. Driver prove that Deuteronomy makes the error of crowding an inordinate number of events in the six months ending in the eleventh month of the fortieth year? It is by collating Numbers xxxiii. 38 with Deut. i. 3. The passage in Numbers is taken from P, a document whose date, according to the critics, is not earlier than the Babylonian exile, and, so, much later than Deuteronomy. The passage in Deuteronomy, says Prof. Driver, 'originally, as can hardly be doubted, formed part of the narrative of P'(p. 7). 'It will have been adapted here by the final redactor of the Pent., for the purpose of adjusting Dt to the scheme of P.' In other words, the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy is disproved by collating two passages; one outside Deuteronomy, later in date; the other inside it, but a later interpolation. Thus Prof. Driver uses late P's mistakes to prove that earlier Deuteronomy cannot have been written by

Probably the strongest argument for the post-Mosaic date of Deuteronomy is the law of the one sanctuary. The argument has two points: (I) the difference between the Deuteronomic law and that in Ex. xx. 24; (2) the practice of the age

from Joshua to Solomon.

Prof. Driver exaggerates the difference between the laws in Exodus and Deuteronomy. He says of the former that it permits altars to be built and sacrifice offered upon them 'in any part of the land, without restriction.' His paraphrase of 'in every place where I record My Name' by 'in any part of the land without restriction' is unfortunate, to say the least. By introducing gratuitously the idea of 'the land,' he brings the law in Exodus into needless and direct opposition with

¹ The argument based on the expression 'beyond Jordan' is of this kind. It occurs in Deuteronomy seven times to express the east of Jordan, and so would seem to imply the point of view of a dweller on the west side. Six times, however, it occurs in what may be regarded as the setting of Deuteronomy, only once is it put into Moses's mouth. In four out of the six the setting is regarded by Prof. Driver as of later date (see pp. 78, 80). Thus only three of the seven instances have any importance. And for these it is quite sufficient to observe that later scribes were wont to assimilate the ancient names of countries, &c., to those current in their own times. For instances in the Old Testament, cf. the words 'compounded with Baal,' and in the New Testament, cf. Bishop Lightfoot's Galatians, p. 3: 'Later transcribers were sorely tempted to substitute the form with which they were most familiar.'

that in Deuteronomy.¹ The words 'without restriction,' in face of the restriction 'in every place where I record My Name,' cannot be justified. Altars were to be erected, not where man pleased, but where God pleased. There were many such places in the desert, so we reconcile Exodus and Deuteronomy. In the promised land there would be only one.

The strength of Prof. Driver's argument (and we frankly admit it is strong) lies in the common practice of good Israelites for many generations. The Law of the one Sanctuary seems to us to have been practically non-existent through the greater part of the pre-exilic history. Are we compelled to infer that it had not yet been formulated?

Much can be said on the other side, though Prof. Driver does not seem to think it worthy of notice. Would it not be fair to say that laws in olden times were little more than statements of principles? In the lack of organized administration, their enforcement depended on the personal feelings of the ruler. As conquered nations were not incorporated into the empire of the conqueror, and quickly threw off the yoke, so laws after they had been promulgated easily became dead letters. The anti-Papal Laws of the fourteenth century are an illustration of this. If we were as ignorant of English as we are of Jewish history, it would be arguable that the pre-Reformation anti-Papal legislation was mythical. The administrating power in Israel can never have been very strong, and was at times excessively weak. Laws laid for awhile on a shelf would generally be forgotten. We may be surprised that the best Israelites should violate laws of Divine authority, but history tells how common such violation has been in all ages.

In the particular case before us special reasons can be given for the habitual non-observance. The physical character of the land was against it. 'Palestine,' says Prof. Adam Smith, 'is almost as much divided into petty provinces as Greece. Formed as it is, and surrounded as it is, it is emphatically a land of tribes.' 2

n.

ne

a

n

at

nh

38

a

u-

er,

aal

ne

ule

er

to

by

te

u-

0-

VS

it

in of

of

st.

gs

th

nis

in, le.

of

he

or

to

mt's

he

¹ No sufficient reason can be given against the hypothesis that the law in Exodus was intended for the wanderings in the desert. The law 'did not warrant indiscriminate altars' (Lex Mosaica, p. 81). Lev. xvii., which Prof. Driver accepts as pre-Deuteronomic in substance, restricts the place of offering sacrifice to the Tabernacle of the Congregation. He gets rid of this piece of evidence by assuming that, as originally formulated, it presupposed a plurality of legitimate sanctuaries, and that it was modified when incorporated into P. 'In its original form the law will have harmonized of course' (the italics are ours) 'with Ex. xx. 24'!!

<sup>2</sup> Historical Geography of the Holy Land, pp. 55, 59.

The history of Israel shows the obstacles in the way of obedience to the Law of the one Sanctuary in active operation. During the days of the Judges the centripetal forces in Israel were excessively weak. When there was no national, there cannot have been any religious unity. When there was war in the gates, Israelites cannot have gone up to Shiloh to We might say of this period, there was no 'law' in Israel; 'every man did that which was right in his own eves.' A law disobeyed for one hundred and fifty years might be regarded as a dead letter, and yet if we may regard the earlier chapters of Samuel as historical—and what Israelite would have imagined a record of corruption so gross?—the shrine at Shiloh at the end of the Judges' period is still Israel's shrine par excellence. But then God refuses the tabernacle of Shiloh. Discredited by the wickedness of Eli's sons, it ceases to be the shrine of the Ark or the centre of Israel's religious life. Religious worship necessarily becomes anomalous; all laws relating to it might be regarded as in abeyance. The refusal of permission to David to build a shrine on Mount Zion prolongs this state of things. Is there not in all these facts a considerable, if not sufficient, explanation, an explanation worthy at least of some passing notice, of 'the practice of the age from Joshua to Solomon'?

We sat down to the study of Prof. Driver's book convinced that we should find in it the critical case stated in its strength. We rise from it convinced that its strength is weakness. The critics loudly call upon us to pull our Old Testament to pieces and to reconstruct it from the foundations. They must produce stronger reasons before we need trouble

ourselves to enter upon the difficult task.

Deuteronomy is the key of the traditional position. When it is lost we shall esteem our old Bibles as little less. But it is in no danger of being lost. Adopting the eloquent words of a writer we have already quoted, Sir W. Muir:

'[Having regard only] to the purely secular and critical view, the inimitable naturalness of Deuteronomy is its own authority. Every chapter has the freshness and reality of contemporary record, or at the least of evidence recorded within such short compass of time as would present the same result. For what else could have imparted that life-like touch which runs throughout the Book? What else caught the breath of pathos and paternal love fresh from the lips of the departing Leader, as, standing on the banks of the Jordan, he gazed on the promised land beyond, and bid his beloved people a last farewell? In fine, the simple book is itself sufficient witness of its being fact and not fiction; a history of the day, not the echo of a bygone tradition' (p. 32).

Fa.

abo

pro

ext

his

of (

ma

one

tha

do

giv

pe

the

us

he

are

a

rej

of

fro

of

WC

of

A

ble

pr

gr

XUM

## ART. IV.—DR. RIGG ON THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

 Oxford High Anglicanism and its Chief Leaders. By JAMES RIGG, D.D. (London, 1895.)

 Modern Anglican Theology. Third Edition, with Memoir of Canon Kingsley prefixed, by J. RIGG, D.D. (London [1880].)

 The Oxford Church Movement. Sketches and Recollections by the late G. WAKELING. (London, 1895.)

Fas est et ab hoste doceri is a rule which we should never be above following, and therefore we gladly turn for instruction to the latest work of Dr. Rigg, who, not agreeing with the proverb that 'good wine needs no bush,' hangs out a rather extensive bush, of which the following is a branch, in front of his wares:

'This volume is the only attempt to write anything like a history of Oxford High Anglicanism which as yet has been, so far as I know, made by a Nonconformist. It is also the only book written by any one which attempts to trace the history from its early origins more than sixty years ago, through its successive developments and phases, down to the present time. These two points, it will be admitted, give a characteristic distinction to the present volume.' 1

At any rate it shall be admitted most frankly by us, and perhaps as we proceed we shall find other points which 'give a characteristic distinction to the present volume.' But, in the first place, we must thank Dr. Rigg for plainly showing us his hand, and not leaving us in any doubt as to whether he is an enemy or not. In reading his pages one's thoughts are carried back to the 'forties.' All the old abuse which, half a century ago, used to be levelled against 'the Puseyites' is reproduced, and it has lost none of its flavour through lapse of time. A few flowers of rhetoric, culled almost at random from Dr. Rigg's pages, will suffice to show this. 'The errors of a superstitious externalism' (p. 9); 'such puerile-and worse than puerile-superstitions as make up the substance of that system of theurgic mysticism which our modern High Anglicans have substituted for the glorious gospel of the blessed God' (p. 18); 'the Movement was an enterprise privately planned, a scheme deeply laid and worked with great subtlety, the fell influence and effects of which at this

1896

ın.

of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Preface, p. vii.

hour are tainting with deadly poison the great, and in some respects admirable, Anglican revival' (p. 42); 'we may justly lament with bitter grief for England and the Church of England the effects of his [Newman's] influence, and still more of the deadlier influence exercised within the Church of England by his friend and early co-worker Pusey. The joint result is that a fatal leaven of essentially Romish doctrine, of Romanising superstition, has taken deep hold of England' (p. 47); 'the two plague spots of Puseyism-of High Church Catholicism—are its sacramental perversions, whereby the holy seals of the Christian faith and profession are turned into superstitions; and its dehumanising doctrine of the confessional' (p. 90) (the writer is so delighted with this sentence that he repeats it word for word on p. 298); 'it was a young and ignorant, as well as bigoted, circle in which the idea of the Oxford Movement first germinated. . . . It was a schoolboyish sort of clique, and in wildness, enthusiasm, ignorance of the actual forces and the gathering movements of the world outside, their projects and dreams remind us of schoolboy plans and projects for moving the world and achieving fame and greatness' (p. 108); 'which ought to open the eyes of all, except those who are completely disciplined and dehumanised ascetic bond-slaves, to the terrible degradation of Christian teaching and principle involved in the doctrines and discipline of "Puseyism"' (p. 252); 'we are reminded of the petty fanaticism of a mediæval devotee, totally ignorant of the writings of St. Paul, and with no knowledge, at first hand, of the Gospels' (p. 254); 'he [Dr. Pusey] was the main strength of the Romanising conspiracy within the Church of England; he was the very Archimago of all the subtlety and mischief which,' &c. (p. 298) and so on da capo.

It is rather a pity that Dr. Rigg has delayed so long before uttering all these philippics. He tells us that his work is 'the work of a septuagenarian, and the fruit of nearly fifty years of reading and observation' (p. vii); and he refers us to his earlier volume, Modern Anglican Theology, published nearly forty years ago, to show us how long it is since he began'the serious study of Oxford Anglicanism' (p. v). But surely a much less period of time than half a century would have been long enough to collect materials for his solemn warnings. It is to be feared that they have now come too late. The poison has entered too deeply into the system to be eradicated even by so powerful an antidote as Dr. Rigg supplies. That it is a powerful one there can be no doubt, for we have his own word for it. One of the many merits of Dr. Rigg as a writer

is that delicathems oppor Christ been no sur

our v

as we

1896

which High there comes 'Rom that t 'Oxfo becau an O it wh thoro with oppor qualif Oxfor inform

that the U

they o

than .

way of University hence right Brodr

of pri will h he is Jan.

me

stly

ng-

e of

and

sult

of

nd'

rch

the

ned

on-

nce

ung

a of

ool-

nce

orld

boy

ıme

s of

de-

n of

and

the

t of

and,

nain

h of

and

ong

ork

fifty

s to

arly

the

ly a

een

It

ison

even

it is

own

riter

is that he has none of that absurd bashfulness and false delicacy which prevent even some able men from asserting themselves. He tells us quite plainly that he is 'one whose opportunities for gaining knowledge of different schools of Christian opinion, both theological and ecclesiastical, have been exceptionally favourable '(p. vii). As we can boast of no such advantages, our best course will be humbly to follow our venerable and exceptionally favoured guide, pointing out as we go along his exceptional qualifications for the task

which he has undertaken.

And first let us notice the originality of the title, 'Oxford High Anglicanism.' It is, perhaps, rather a clumsy title, but there are reasons for it. The term 'High Anglicanism' comes of the author's kindness; it is a mere euphemism for 'Romanism;' for it is the whole object of his work to show that the two terms are virtually synonymous. And the word 'Oxford' is rightly inserted before 'High Anglicanism; because the movement which he describes was essentially an Oxford movement, and no one can adequately describe it who is not thoroughly steeped in Oxford ideas and thoroughly familiar with Oxford ways. Let us begin, then, with pointing out how exceptionally favourable Dr. Rigg's opportunities must have been for gaining this requisite qualification; indeed, so exceptional, that we fancy our Oxford readers will derive from his pages a large amount of information which they never learnt at Oxford, and which they certainly could never have gained from any other source than Dr. Rigg's book.

Before they have finished two pages they will have learnt that the famous President of Magdalen, Dr. Routh, was professor of something or other. Even Dr. Rigg does not inform us of what. He simply calls him 'Professor Routh' (p. 3); but it is a point gained to have learnt that he was a professor at all; for his admiring biographer, Dean Burgon, and even

the University Calendar culpably ignore the fact.

Proceeding a little further they will be taught the proper way of describing and addressing the Heads of Houses in their University; 'Provost Hawkins, provost of his college' (p. 44); henceforth they will be careful to remember that it is the right thing to speak of Provost Monro, Master Bright, Warden Brodrick, President Fowler, Rector Merry, and so forth.

Again, Dr. Rigg has evidently received a large amount of private information about the Oxford examinations which will be quite news to the ordinary Oxonian. On this point he is not quite so explicit as could be wished, and we trust

VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

that he will enlighten our ignorance more fully in his next edition. What, for example, is meant by Pusey having 'finally gained a first class, with high honour' (p. 203)? The first class itself was a high honour, but there appears to have been some other high honour combined with it; and we should like to know what it was. Again, from the account of Mr. Ward's examination, we seem to gather obscurely that it was the custom at Oxford to mix up classics and mathematics all together, and to award the class on the general For 'Ward took his degree in 1833, attaining a second class, notwithstanding his wilful negligence and wayward faults as a student both in classics and mathematics' (p. 79). But it is when he gives us private information about the fellowship examinations that we attend to Dr. Rigg with the most breathless interest; for, as they are not altogether public examinations, it can only be those who are within the most esoteric circles of Oxford who can give us really trustworthy accounts. Outsiders, for instance, will never have heard of such an expression as this: 'Whately, Keble, Hawkins, Jelf, were of the Fellowship' (p. 297) (the italics are ours). We are sure, by the way, that Dr. Rigg will thank us for drawing his attention to a significant fact which may, perhaps, help him to demonstrate still more convincingly that the first leaders of the Oxford Movement were overrated men. He will find that they were all, as well as many of their most prominent disciples, 'of the Fellowship'-Keble, Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude, the Mozleys and the Wilberforces, Marriott and Church were all of the Fellowship of Oriel; Ward and Oakeley were of the Fellowship of Balliol; Isaac Williams and W. J. Copeland were of the Fellowship of Trinity; Sewell, of Exeter; Sibthorp, of Magdalen; Mark Pattison (in those early days an Oxford High Anglican), of Lincoln. Now, may there not have been a deep conspiracy here? The popular view is that men are made 'of the Fellowship' on account of their learning, culture, and so forth; but is it not to be feared that these men were made 'of the Fellowship' (the expression is so delightful that we cannot help repeating it) on purpose to further the sinister designs of Oxford High Anglicanism? We are confirmed in this opinion by what we learn from Dr. Rigg concerning both Pusey's and Keble's election at Oriel. They were neither of them, he intimates, up to the mark. 'Without doubt,' he says, speaking ex cathedra, 'Pusey was intellectually below the Oriel standard' (p. 207); and that, in spite of his having taken, not only a first class, but 'a first class with high honour.' It has generally been supposed that

Oriel of the tion in O and was those count clude Puse ship, not to

1896

fellow know consc where manif Keble ment his lif (p. 9) so for

of th

write

rally

Dr. R Some ago w Marri come had e: influe: extract knowl from literar others duced Twelv

fancy he tur him;

so, we

would

Jan.

next

ving

The

have

d we

count

that

neral

ng a

way-

atics'

about

with

ether

in the

trust-

have

Ceble,

cs are

nk us

, per-

at the

n. He

t pro-Pusey,

tt and

akeley

W. J.

xeter;

days

ere not

is that

irning,

these

so de-

to fur-

? We

r. Rigg

They

Vithout

ntellec-

n spite

st class

d that

Oriel attained its intellectual pre-eminence in the early part of this century by throwing open its fellowships to competition; and that then Balliol, and then other colleges followed in Oriel's wake. But Dr. Rigg has been behind the scenes and knows better. 'It is evident enough that his [Pusey's] was a favoured suit for preferment from the very outset. those times intellectual merit and scholarly attainments counted for less in the competition for fellowships [Oriel included] than they do at present' (p. 207). Thus it was that Pusey 'won'-had we not better say fluked into?-his Fellowship, 'though with the significant qualification that he was not to be a college tutor' (ibid.). Here again we have one of those delicate little touches which show at once that a writer is perfect master of his subject. It may not be generally known that the rule is that when a man is elected to a fellowship he is made a college tutor at once. But Dr. Rigg knows it; and he knows also that even the Oriel electors had conscience enough to feel that they must draw the line somewhere, and to draw it at the tutorship when they foisted so manifestly incompetent a man as Pusey into the Fellowship. Keble's again must have been 'a favoured suit for preferment' at Oriel. 'Intellectually Keble was not at any time of his life the equal of such men' as some of his brother-fellows (p. 9); he was 'their immature and unequal colleague,' and

Another leader of the Oxford High Anglicans whom Dr. Rigg brings down to his proper level is Charles Marriott. Some of our readers who knew Oxford forty or fifty years ago will remember the awe and reverence in which Charles Marriott was then held, as the man who above all others had come to the rescue when Newman deserted the ship; who had exercised, though in a very different way, some of the influence which Newman once exercised, and who had an extraordinary reputation for scholarship, theology, and general To such it will be a distinct revelation to learn knowledge. from Dr. Rigg that Charles Marriott 'was little more than a literary drudge, an editorial hack, working to the order of others' (p. 91). Can it be that Dr. Rigg has merely reproduced, in a perverted form, a passage from Dean Burgon's Twelve Good Men, in itself not a very accurate passage? If so, we should like to have heard what Dean Burgon himself would have said on the subject, had he been living. One can fancy how fiercely he would have turned upon Dr. Rigg, as he turned upon Mr. Reginald Wilberforce, and annihilated him; only Dr. Rigg is rather a difficult person to annihilate. But no! no! Dr. Rigg has some private information; his intimate acquaintance with Oxford enabled him to know what the outside world of Oxford did not know, and to appreciate the overrated Charles Marriott at his true

estimate.

In fact, all the Oxford leaders evidently require to be taken down a peg, and Dr. Rigg is the man to perform the operation. We cannot always quite follow him; but the reason, no doubt, is, that we are tainted with the ignorance which appears from the present volume to be a marked feature of Oxford High Anglicans. For instance, he not only admits, but repeats several times, that both Keble and Pusey led 'pious, saintly lives;' but really, for saints, they seem to us to have had some very queer ways. Both were Romanists at heart, and ought consistently to have gone over to Rome; but

'Keble had neither logic nor courage to take him across the line, and therefore remained a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England, while his esoteric principles were those of a Gallican Romanist. In the secret place of his doctrinal sympathies he was one at heart with Bossuet or Dupin' (p. 58).

Now a man who could consciously maintain so false a position for more than thirty years, deceiving every one, and allowing the many who looked up to him to think that he was one thing, while he had not the courage to own that he was in reality something quite different, we should be inclined to call, not a saint, but a poltroon and a knave. Pusey's conduct was still more flagrant. Not only was he secretly a Romanist, but he set himself to work 'silently and subtilly,' 'using disingenuous subterfuges,' 'never dealing frankly and directly,' to lure men on to the brink of an abyss, and then, as it were, to give them a quiet push over, while he himself remained on the margin to the end. And he had really no temptation which could be pleaded as an excuse for his perfidy. The emoluments of his professorship and canonry were no object to him, for he had large private means; and we do not gather from Dr. Rigg's account that he was at all fond of money; neither do we gather that he was ambitious. He is represented as a morose, brooding recluse, who had no desire to make a noise in the world, but only to do as much mischief as he could. It must have been sheer devilry.

It is, however, rather curious that Pusey's intimate friend, Newman, after he had joined the Church of Rome, when he would naturally be inclined to take as hopeful a view as poss exar

tion

Cathebe or I bell him, was on though essen

view disag to 'h mino whic defic

A

So 1

the 'Gern the i Puse than that abou Rose that to Pu

before place.

the su
stude:

This

pose,

Pusey

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For Keble see pp. 6, 8, 27; for Pusey, pp. 197, 222, 236, 239.

n; his know and to s true

e taken eration. oubt, is, rs from I High repeats saintly we had rt, and

the line, nurch of Gallican he was

ne, and

that he

that he inclined y's concretly a ubtilly, kly and d then, himself eally no for his canonry

canonry
ns; and
as at all
abitious
had no
as much

friend, when he view as

239.

possible of the chances of his friend following his own example, could see no symptom whatever of Pusey's inclination to take such a step. These are his words:

'People are apt to say that he [Pusey] was once nearer to the Catholic Church than he is now [1864]. I pray God that he may be one day far nearer to the Catholic Church than he was then, for I believe that, in his reason and judgment, all the time that I knew him, he never was near to it at all. When I became a Catholic I was often asked, "What of Dr. Pusey?" When I said that I did not see any symptoms of his doing as I had done, I was sometimes thought uncharitable. If confidence in his position is (as it is) a first essential in the leader of a party, this Dr. Pusey possessed preeminently.' 1

So Dr. Newman and Dr. Rigg take diametrically opposite views of Dr. Pusey's attitude. Who shall decide when doctors disagree?

But this is not the only point on which the two hopelessly disagree in their views about Pusey. Newman bears testimony to 'his great learning, his immense diligence, his scholar-like mind'—in fact, to his possession of just those qualities in which, on the unimpeachable testimony of Dr. Rigg, he was deficient when he fluked into his fellowship at Oriel.

Another instance of Dr. Rigg's knowledge of Oxford in the 'twenties' appears in his account of the controversy about German theology between Pusey and Rose. It was certainly the impression among outsiders at Oxford at the time that Pusey, young as he was, knew more about German theology than any man in the University. But Dr. Rigg has discovered that he knew nothing at all about it; indeed, he knows more about the combats than the combatants knew themselves. Rose says that Pusey knew more than Rose; Dr. Rigg says that Rose knew more than Pusey. This is what Rose says to Pusey:

'Most heartily do I wish we had known each other personally before that German war, and I am sure it would never have taken place. I should have profited by your very far superior knowledge of the subject,<sup>2</sup> and should have done the work of warning the English student more effectually.' <sup>3</sup>

This is what Dr. Rigg says:

'He [Pusey], with characteristic self-confidence, formed the purpose, whilst still in Germany, of replying to Rose. Mr. Rose at that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Apologia, chap. ii. <sup>2</sup> The italics are in all cases ours. <sup>3</sup> Letter from Mr. H. J. Rose to Dr. Pusey, quoted in the Life of Pusey, i. 176.

time was a clergyman of high distinction and great influence, being many years, of course, Pusey's senior. Pusey was only twenty-six, and not yet a Deacon. He was a young layman who knew little of theology, and who, as to German studies and history, must be regarded as a mere neophyte. But he had no hesitation as to measuring swords with Dr. Rose' (p. 210).

Far be it from us to measure swords with Dr. Rigg on any question of theology; but on a mere question of dates we may venture to put in a humble protest. H. J. Rose was born in 1795, Pusey in 1800. Does a single *lustrum* make one man 'many years, of course,' another man's 'senior'? And was it really the height of impudence for a man of twenty-six, who was confessedly a most industrious student, to express his disagreement with a man of thirty-one?

We have, again, in this remarkable volume some curious and quite original information about Mr. Keble as well as about Dr. Pusey. Indeed, Dr. Rigg has made a really valuable discovery, as the following passages, referring to

The Christian Year, will show:

'Besides its intrinsic beauty, its character as a companion to the Prayer Book, and, in particular, to the Daily Service, could not but recommend it, &c. . . . The world could not furnish such a clientela for a denominational poet to appeal to as was open to an Anglican poet who should provide pleasant and pious daily morsels of appropriate sentiment and graceful verse for the votaries of his Church,' &c. (p. 27).

'If Keble had been a greater poet he could never have clung so tenaciously throughout to the Daily Service, with its calendared events and services. . . . But his feminine genius clung like the ivy to the forms of the Church which he so often apostrophises as his "Mother;" and it is the one praise and merit of his poetry that it has draped and festooned the daily order of service with tender and graceful verse'

(p. 30).

Now, if words mean anything, these passages surely imply that Keble has written a hymn for every day in the year. It would be an utterly inadequate way of 'draping and festooning the daily order of service'—the Daily Service, too, 'with its calendared events and services,' that is, 'a Service with services'—and of supplying 'pleasant and pious daily morsels,' if it merely meant that 'votaries of his Church' might use his morning and evening hymns if they liked. In fact, this is not what Dr. Rigg does mean, for he contrasts Keble's advantages over the Wesleys in this respect; and the Wesleys wrote morning and evening hymns. No! Dr. Rigg must have made a great discovery. There are, we

belie The which clusion 270 which

1896

whice tions he we the west for the west states and the west states are the west states

now

give insta us ta who open Chur after geni

as is

Engl

(p. 2

As wish time face abas have

thos

of t New but pher civil he is man Was femi this

cons

of a

being nty-six, ittle of be reisuring

gg on dates se was make mior'? an of udent,

really really

ion to ld not such a to an morsels of his

to the ther;"
ed and verse'

n the aping Serlat is, and of his they or he spect;

re, we

believe, 365 days in the year, and we find from our copy of *The Christian Year* that there are only ninety-five days for which hymns are therein published. The irresistible conclusion is that Dr. Rigg actually knows of no less than 270 hymns written by the author of *The Christian Year* of which those whose 'opportunities' have been less 'exceptionally favourable' know absolutely nothing at all! Surely he will not keep all this knowledge to himself, but will give the world some at least of his hidden treasure.

Though Dr. Rigg keeps in the main the vials of his wrath for the Oxford High Anglicans, he sprinkles a drop or two now and then upon those who hail from Cambridge, and can give quite new information about them. We have seen one

give quite new information about them. We have seen one instance in his contradiction of Mr. Hugh James Rose. Let us take another. If there was one man who seemed to all, who knew him less intimately than Dr. Rigg doubtless did, open as the daylight, outspoken even to a fault, an English Churchman to the backbone, without any hankering whatever after any other religious communion, it was surely the late genial Dean of Lincoln. But Dr. Rigg knows better.

'Canon Butler, of Wantage and Worcester, as high a Churchman as is at all compatible with any sort of loyalty to the Church of England—there was not a little of the Romeward tendency in him' (p. 270).

As in the case of Dean Burgon, one really could have wished that Dr. Rigg had written this in Dean Butler's lifetime, and that he and the Dean could have been brought face to face. Dr. Rigg is too courageous a man to be easily abashed, but we cannot help thinking that his courage would have been severely tried by the interview.

Dr. Rigg has a little, but not much, better opinion of those Oxford High Anglicans who went over to Rome than of those who remained to the last in the English Church. Newman, Ward, and Faber come in for a word of praise; but he is never weary of telling us about the ignorance—'the phenomenal ignorance'—of the two former of all history, civil and ecclesiastical. No less than nine distinct times does he insist upon this supposed deficiency in the case of Newman, and no less than thirteen distinct times in the case of Ward. We shall not, too, forget easily that Newman's was a feminine genius, for no less than nine times does he recur to this defect in the great leader's character, while six times are considered sufficient to stamp upon our minds the existence of a similar defect in the character of Keble. In opposition

to Mr. R. H. Hutton, he devotes many pages to prove that Newman was not 'a great man;' and, on the whole, Ward, though his good points are dwelt upon, appears as a man rather to be laughed at, and with, than to be admired.

It would, perhaps, have been some little comfort to the Oxford leaders, if they had been still living, to find that, low as Dr. Rigg's opinion of them is, it is still lower of the

Christian Fathers:

'The great authorities recognised [in the Tracts for the Times] were "the Fathers" of the first four centuries. Their teachings and the Church practices which their writings disclosed were assumed to be the teachings and practices of the primitive Church, although, in fact, the actual development of the Church during the first four centuries of its existence had so modified, and even transformed, the teachings of Christ and the apostles into conformity with the spirit of "the world," and the seductive precedents and practices of surrounding paganism, as to make up a whole of Church organisation and influence sadly in contrast, at many points, with the purity, simplicity, and unworldly majesty of true primitive Christianity' (p. 50).

'He [Pusey] was dazzled by the picture of visible external unity, as presented in the writings of the hierarchical "Fathers" of the patristic age, who had themselves departed from the spiritual simplicity and majesty of St. Paul's teaching as to the Church' (p. 215).

'It seems abundantly clear that the teachings of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, and in particular of St. Paul, scarcely enter into the theology of Pusey, except so far as they may have been recognised directly or indirectly—or, as is not seldom the case, utterly perverted—by the patristic authorities on whom he

relied' (p. 258).

'Extracts from the "Fathers" of the centuries succeeding the period of pure and apostolic doctrine in the Church; that is to say, the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. . . The sayings of these imperfectly informed writers—these, for the most part, altogether undisciplined thinkers and teachers—their grossest confusions of thought, their turgid and exaggerated rhetoric . . . the crude and gross language of the men whom Pusey calls the Fathers of the Church' (p. 288).

From the first of these passages one would gather that Dr. Rigg would sweep away with one fell blow the whole body of the Fathers, from St. Clemens Romanus and St. Polycarp downwards. But let us assume that the last-quoted passage, limiting his condemnation of the Fathers to those of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, expresses more accurately his meaning. Still, even with this limitation, the works of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, St. Vincent of Lerins, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St.

Jero Ind this thin will Dr.

1896

Fath that fath retuchild

sma

opin

and But for I siste sets rece reas scho neve pow

who

take

lead

he d

of t

critic Keb to a J. T this disa was of h is ra justi desc (p. 1

estir

form

87,

Jan.

that Jerome
Vard, Index
man this w
thing to
low Dr. R
f the Father
that t

s and led to gh, in four d, the spirit less of sation ourity, anity

unity,
of the
l sim215).
Bible,
Paul,
y may
om the
om he

ng the to say, these ogether ons of de and of the

whole
and St.
quoted
cose of
c

Jerome, and St. Athanasius are all placed on Dr. Rigg's 'Index Expurgatorius;' so, if any of our readers possess all this worthless, and worse than worthless, lumber, the best thing they can do will be to burn it at once, and then they will have more room on their shelves for the works of Dr. Rigg. Dr. Rigg, it will be observed, always puts 'the Fathers' in inverted commas, to indicate, it may be presumed, that they had no title to the name, or that they were no fathers of his. Perhaps these obsolete authorities might have returned the compliment, and declared that Dr. Rigg was no child of theirs.

After this drastic treatment of the Fathers, it is but a small matter to note that Dr. Rigg has the very poorest opinion of the great English public schools, Eton, Harrow, and Winchester in especial coming in heavily for his lash. But his desire to belittle the Oxford leaders is too strong even for his dislike of these institutions; so, with a trifling inconsistency, which we have no doubt can be easily explained, he sets it down as one of the defects of Keble that he had not received a public school education. But there is an obvious reason for Dr. Rigg's general dislike of our great public schools; for, alas! the truth must out; Wesleyan Methodism never has been, and probably never will be, a really influential power either at Eton or at Harrow or at Winchester.

Dr. Rigg is quite alive to the fact that a number of writers whom the public has been so deluded as to read and admire, take a different estimate of these Oxford High Anglican leaders from his own. With characteristic courage, therefore, he devotes a considerable portion of his volume to a criticism of their works, and it is scarcely necessary to say that his criticism is not altogether favourable. He begins with John Keble; and, ignoring the very interesting and, we are glad to add, popular sketch by Mr. Lock, refers continually to Sir J. T. Coleridge's earlier memoir. He has no hard words for this beyond a remark in a note that 'the Life is somewhat disappointing,' in which we agree, and that 'the aged author was very feeble, and lived not many days after the publication of his biography' (p. 2). And, though the patronizing tone is rather irritating, we gladly admit that he endeavours to do justice to Dean Church's Oxford Movement, which he rightly describes as 'a work unique in its authority and importance' (p. 100). He accounts for the differences between the Dean's estimate and his own by intimating more than once that the former was 'not free from prejudice' and 'biassed' (see pp. 87, 93); he himself, of course, being quite exempt from all

th

se

ar

W

sh

(p

tra

va

ge

to

un

· 1

SIL

by

ne

· S

ex

spe It

cec

da

tion

im

ana

He

into he

slig

tha

foll

terr

you

train

nev

sim

apar

ralit

of i

pow

taste

prejudice and bias whatsoever. We are rather startled, however, to learn that 'the style' of this admirable piece of composition 'is not altogether finished' (p. 87), and that the writer was 'conscious of the false position of the Church of England' (p. 93), a fact which we, who were no doubt not so well acquainted with the late Dean as Dr. Rigg was, had certainly never discovered; nor had we the least idea that the Dean was ever hurrying away post-haste to Rome, and suddenly pulled up, as seems to be suggested by the somewhat curt and blunt heading of one of Dr. Rigg's pages, 'Where Church stopped short' (p. 98).

It required a bold man to criticize at this time of day Dr. Newman's Apologia pro Vitâ suâ. But Dr. Rigg is a bold man, and is quite equal to the occasion. The Apologia shows in one passage 'how narrow, with all its keenness and subtlety, was the intellect of Newman,' while another is 'no less indicative of intellectual weakness on the part of Newman' (p. 118), and another proves that 'personal reminiscences are perhaps as little to be trusted about one's self as about one's friends' (p. 12); and the whole gist of the Apologia is summed up in a passage which we venture to transcribe in full:

'The Apologia, perfectly written as it is, is nevertheless a humiliating tissue of disclosures. It reveals an acute, subtle, sceptical intellect, penned up within narrow limits, and exercising its faculties in a dim and darkling sphere, groping its way from premiss to consequence, often from fallacy to fallacy, and only discerning the error of the latest fallacy through which it has passed in order to plunge into a new, subtler, deeper, and more perilous error, until at last, utterly wearied out, it sinks down, self-blinded, to find its rest henceforth within the arms of Popish despotism and superstition' (pp. 158-9).

Holding these views, Dr. Rigg is naturally rather severe upon Mr. R. H. Hutton's study of Newman in the 'English Leaders of Religion' series. In one place he says, Mr. Hutton's 'monograph is all in the wrong direction' (p. 126); in another, his 'description of his hero is purely imaginary' (p. 129); in another, 'he seems not to have fathomed his true character' (p. 132); in another, he 'has missed the key to Newman's whole character and course;' and in another, 'all through his volume he appears to be ignorant of the true character and quality of faith as taught by Newman' (p. 144). This is rather a heavy line to take against the thoughtful and highly cultured editor of the Spectator; but then Dr. Rigg does take heavy lines.

He is still more severe upon Canon Liddon, whom he considers as virtually the writer of all the three volumes of

XUM

t the ch of oot so is, had that e, and someboages, bold shows of lety, indiin' (p. es are

Jan.

how-

mmed
iliating
itellect,
a dim
quence,
of the
into a
utterly
aceforth
(8–9).

one's

severe English utton's nother, 29); in tracter's ugh his iser and This is highly pes take

nom he umes of

the Life of Dr. Pusey which have yet appeared; in fact, he seems to regard it as his own special mission to supplement and correct that work. 'The biographer has been prudent as well as authentic, and has discreetly left certain points in the shade which it will be necessary for me to bring into the light'1 (p. 217). 'The biography contains no real explanation of the tract [on Baptism], although some pages are occupied in vague statements, partly quotations, intended to indicate its general purpose and drift. This deficiency I must endeavour to supply' (p. 223). 'His biography sets forth, I will not say unfairly, rather I should say inevitably, a biassed and too favourable view of his whole character and influence' (p. 240). 'I shall, as I have intimated before, make it my business to supplement the information afforded by Dr. Liddon, who has by no means furnished all the facts and evidence which are necessary in order to a complete and true judgment of the character and influence of the "Master in Israel," &c.' (p. 247). 'So much in general Dr. Liddon has to say by way of explaining, and at the same time explaining away what he speaks of as exaggerated and distorted stories, &c.' (p. 275). 'It is evident that, in this third volume, as in the volume preceding, the biography omits singularly important and very damaging evidence, &c.' (p. 280). By what strange association of ideas is it, we wonder, that we think of Colley Cibber improving upon Shakespeare?

Mr. Wakeling's rather rambling and superficial Sketches and Recollections form a curious comment upon Dr. Rigg. Here we have a man who threw himself heart and soul into the Oxford Movement without the faintest idea that he was thereby setting his face Romeward, and without the slightest inclination or temptation from first to last to take that step which Dr. Rigg assures us all ought to take who follow such dangerous guides as the Oxford leaders. terrible picture of priestly presumption and intolerance, of young neophytes acting as father confessors without any training, of domestic sanctity invaded, and all the rest of it, never seems to have presented itself to Mr. Wakeling. He simply saw clerical activity taking the place of clerical apathy-definite doctrines taught instead of vague generalities, God worshipped in the beauty of holiness instead of in the slovenliness of neglect, the Church made a real power instead of a roi fainéant, good taste instead of bad taste in the arrangement of the fabrics, and good music

<sup>1</sup> The italics are in all cases ours.

ti

h

n

h

e

Si

h

a

d

q

st

u

de

SC

di

01

B

th

ar

pl

pa

hi

at

th

ar

th

instead of bad music in the choirs; and he attributes, and surely with good reason in the main, all these changes for the better to the Oxford Movement. He does not go deeply into the reason of things; he simply describes what he saw and heard, and describes it just as one of the class to which he belonged would. And this is the cause why we touch upon his work, which we cannot honestly recommend, for both its style and its matter are feeble enough; but it illustrates the mind of a class. Dr. Rigg calls the Church of England 'the Church of the gentle, the dainty, the leisurely, the cultured ' (p. 27). So it is, but of other classes also. Mr. Wakeling evidently belongs to that class which is vaguely termed 'men of business,' ranging from the professional man to the intelligent and well-educated (as far as he goes) artisan. Among this class there are a vast number of men and women who have been touched by the Oxford Movement as they were never touched before. It is too obvious to need notice that Methodism has never reached those whom Dr. Rigg terms 'the gentle, the dainty,' &c. But besides these there are a vast number of the type of Mr. Wakeling and of a lower class who are, and always will be, out of the pale of Methodism. They will be Church people if they are anything; and the Oxford Movement supplied them with just that scope for enthusiasm, and that appeal to their emotional as well as their moral and intellectual side, which the old-fashioned 'high and dry' or 'low and slow' type of churchmanship would fail to do. They are perfectly satisfied with their Anglican Church as it is, and have really not the smallest inclination towards Rome. In the name of our common Christianity we ask that they may be left alone. Surely it is not an unreasonable request. They do not interfere with Dr. Rigg; why should Dr. Rigg desire to interfere with them?

## ART. V.—BISHOP FRENCH OF LAHORE.

The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Valpy French, First Bishop of Lahore. By the Rev. HERBERT BIRKS, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, &c. With Portrait and Illustrations. Two Vols. 8vo. (London, 1895.)

WE were disposed for many reasons to offer a cordial welcome to the biography of so eminent a missionary pioneer as was Bishop Thomas Valpy French. To all who possessed even a cursory acquaintance with Church of England Missions and the into and n he ipon h its nind urch . So ongs ging cated vast v the It is ched But Mr. ll be, eople plied eal to side, slow fectly really me of alone. inter-

Jan.

, First M.A., th Por-1895.)

erfere

al welneer as ssessed issions during the last half-century his name has been a household word. The distinction of his university career, the entire selfabandon with which he gave himself to the work of evangelizing the Moslem, his penetrating and far-reaching grasp of the Mahommedan mission-field and of the essential conditions for its successful occupation, the singular influence which he exerted in the foundation and furtherance of such wellmatured mission schemes as that of the Cambridge brotherhood at Delhi, his noble conduct during the Mutiny, and the energy which he threw into the too brief episcopate, whose authority he estimated so loftily and whose honours he resigned directly he felt he could not longer use them to the full benefit of the Church of God, all combined to throw into high relief a personality of exceptional force, alike in the originality and depth of his convictions and in his unbending and implicit submission to their dictates. And when, having laid down his episcopal crozier, he set forth single-handed as a mission priest to attempt the conversion of Islam in its distant and rugged stronghold, with health sadly weakened and borne down with the weight of years, even those who questioned the judgment of a venture before which the stoutest might have blenched could not withhold their unqualified admiration of the spirit which had prompted it. A life so varied, so consecrated, so crowned, demands and deserves the fullest recognition; yet, even in the case of one so distinguished, it is well to biographize according to the proportion of leisure attainable in these our hurried, crowded days. We write in no spirit of carping criticism. We can sympathize with, and can readily understand, the temptation, out of so vast a store of manuscript as was placed at Mr. Birks's disposal, to transfer to his pages first one extract and then another, until they swelled to their present more than ample dimensions. With the selection of his materials out of so great an embarras de richesses, and with the use the author has made of them, we make no complaint. Mr. Birks displays a full acquaintance with his theme, and has spared no pains to elucidate it in all its parts. But in the interest of his subject, and the great missionary cause he had so much at heart, we deeply lament his lack of power of condensation. A bright octavo volume of some four hundred pages, in which the memory of this saint and hero would have been veritably embalmed, would have commanded a wider circle of readers, and obtained more extended interest in missionary work, than is likely to be effected by the two portly volumes beneath which the memory of Bishop French is here entombed.

Thomas Valpy French, the eldest son of the Rev. Peter French, vicar of Holy Trinity, Burton-on-Trent, and of Penelope Arabella, daughter of the well-known Dr. Valpy of Reading, was born on New Year's Day, 1825. His home and its conditions formed an ideal training ground for a great Church leader. In the ancient abbey, then transformed into a commodious parsonage, the boy was surrounded from his infancy with an atmosphere of refinement, learning, and piety, free from sordid cares and full of high thoughts and aspirations. At Reading first, and then at Rugby under Arnold and Tate successively, he received sound classical training, which won him a scholarship at University College, Oxford, when he was eighteen years old. His undergraduate life was passed at a stirring time, which included the condemnation of W. G. Ward's Ideal and Dr. Newman's secession to Rome. No young man of French's serious bent could fail to be interested in these events, but he did not let them divert his mind from the studies which are the proper business of a university man. He held, as we think quite rightly, that into these studies 'young men should throw their whole strength, and that they should neither fritter away their intellectual energies over a thousand mighty problems of life and theology, all lightly touched and not one deeply pondered, nor divert to labours of philanthropy and Christian work enthusiasm due to other things' (i. 9). He had already adopted as his guide the precept, 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might,' and was steadily amassing materials for thinking before attempting to give expression to his thought. A serious earnestness, a marked independence of character which yet yearned painfully for the sympathy from which his convictions seemed to exclude him, and such a thoroughness in facing the deep problems which Lucretius, for example, suggested as is uncommon amongst even thoughtful undergraduates, marked the student days which were crowned by a place in the same first class with Professors Conington, Ince, and Bright, and two years later by the Chancellor's prize for a Latin essay on The Causes of the Shortlived Greatness of Mercantile Communities.

A brief extract from Dr. Bright's recollections of French will show the impression he made on his contemporaries:

'He was usually grave, perhaps even shy, and I remember thinking that he seldom laughed. . . . We did not then at all know what there was in him. Nobody, I should think, would have deemed it possible that the quiet-looking scholar, not much like the usual public school type, undoubtedly able, conspicuously excellent, would

one Ch

189

one ma ima fore so

Ma

the

fro ses infl Jan lod pro wei ties dee add Ru in a app turi dre the offe frie

inti

wor

his

pur

Her

his

The

by 1

Fre

Tri

at A and Corntano

one day develop a character that might remind Christians and Churchmen of those who had associated the name of missionary with such words as "heroic" and "apostolic." The sort of aloofness that one observed in him, the want of brightness and youthfulness in his manner (which, however accounted for, did, I think, exist), might be imagined in the light of after events to indicate a sort of unconscious forecast of that exceptional devotedness which carried him through so many risks and endurances to a death that resembled those of Martyn and of Xavier' (i. 13).

After entrance into Holy Orders a college tutorship seemed the natural sequel to so distinguished a university career, but from childhood a vague longing for mission service had possessed Thomas French's mind. For some time contending influences distracted his decision. His desire to marry Miss Janson, a young lady whom he had met at the Warden's lodge at Wadham, and who eventually became his wife, the prospect of much usefulness at Oxford, where many parents were anxious to put their sons under his charge, and home ties of great strength and tenderness, drew him one way; the deep impression produced by his brother Peter's early death, added to the earnest personal request of his friend Fox, the Rugby missionary, to come and join him in India, drew him in another. In this hesitation a speech of Bishop Wilberforce appealing to Oxford men for service in the foreign mission-field turned the scale. Having put his hand to the plough, he never dreamed of turning back. A few days after his application to the Church Missionary Society the coveted college tutorship was offered him; before he had made up his mind his missionary friend, Fox, had been called up higher, and his own closest intimate, Arthur Lea, who had also given himself to mission work, had been injured in a railway accident and had died in his arms. But none of these things moved him from his purpose. His heart was drawn to Agra, where Abdul Masih, Henry Martyn's only convert, had worked successfully until his death, after which this branch of the mission had declined. The Church Missionary Society had determined to revive it by planting there an educational establishment, over which French was to preside, with Mr. Edward Craig Stuart, of Trinity College, Dublin, as his colleague.

A considerable missionary station was already in existence at Agra, including large orphan schools, a Christian village, and a congregation worshipping in a church erected by Bishop Corrie; but the opening of the Punjab gave it fresh importance as the basis of extended operations, and it had been long desired to establish there a college which might educate

was on of ome. o be rt his of a

into

Jan.

eter

d of

y of

ome

reat

into

n his

iety, pira-

rnold

ning,

ford,

ngth, ctual theo-, nor c enopted to do, als for ought.

racter
ch his
hness
mple,
indered by
, Ince,
ize for

rench

ess of

thinkw what med it usual would the sons of the wealthier classes, and might bring their parents into direct contact with the Christian clergy. The city numbered 90,000 souls when French reached it (February 13, 1851), amongst whom the Mahommedans were the most influential, It contained the noblest remains of the Mogul Empire, and French was profoundly moved by the splendour and beauty of its Moslem architecture, which includes the Taj Mahal, the renowned mausoleum of Shah Jehan, which he spoke of as 'indescribable.' These monuments of a great past, so eloquent of the capacity of their builders, the traditions of the spot recalling memories of Abdul Masih's sweetness of demeanour and words of unfeigned humility—such as might have dropped from the lips of St. Francis—the consciousness that he was holding one of the advanced posts in the enemy's country, and was raising the standard of the Cross where the Trident of Shiva and the Crescent of the Moslem had long held undisputed sway, all filled him with lofty thoughts upon the high importance of his office, and deepened his convictions that one day there might spring from St. John's College, Agra, a band of native evangelists, catechists, and teachers, to whom the founders of native churches might turn for a supply of qualified instructors, and 'might contribute materially to the regeneration of this great people,' as he rightly called them. He took the deepest interest in all educational problems, and was specially desirous that the college instruction should be carried on in the vernacular.

'It seems to me,' he urged, 'that it would be no small advantage if we could enlist for Christianity all the associations connected in the mind of the Hindus with their venerable and beautiful language, gathering out what is pure in the language from the mass of corrupt notions which it has been employed to express' (i. 44).

His own efforts to master Urdu were so strenuous and persevering that he soon distanced his pupils, learning their vernacular much more rapidly than they could acquire English. But, although he had undoubtedly what his biographer calls special linguistic aptitude, and was in later years known as the 'haft-zaban Padri'—the seven-tongued father—with him, as with other men of eminence, in hard work lay the secret of his success. Ten hours' labour daily in the burning heat of India was the measure which his fervent charity exacted, now that the gift of tongues has ceased.

'I have a new moonshee,' he wrote at Eastertide, 1851, 'who comes three days a week for four hours to teach me Urdu and Persian, and a pundit, who comes daily two hours to teach me

in sh so wi

Fr

TI

the

H

to an the He nu boot tim of por by mi

ser of

was

of

eve

lovi

rest was four dev We ness mos simp with com

V

min

relie

arents num-1851), ential. e, and peauty al, the of as oquent e spot eanour ropped he was ountry, Crident g held on the rictions college, hers, to supply ially to

Jan.

Ivantage ected in anguage, f corrupt

called oblems,

should

ous and ng their acquire his bioer years d father rd work ly in the fervent sed.

351, 'who Jrdu and teach me Hinduwi. Then I have four hours at the school three days a week, besides their occasionally coming to my house. In the evening the three or four young men to whom we are giving instruction usually come, some one or more of them. Then I have what is yet more important at present, my Urdu and Hinduwi reading, which is cut short from other work far more than I could wish. Though I rise soon after four, it is exceedingly hard to work so as to be at all satisfied with my progress through the day' (i. 45).

It requires some effort of thought, as well as considerable acquaintance with the small details of everyday life in India, to realize the difficulties and discouragements under which French persevered in such laborious and self-denying toil. The work that fell to him was multifarious indeed. Besides the study of classical Hindustani, he burned with eagerness to be able to preach so as to be understood by the illiterate and the poor. He tested his book learning by talking with the villagers, and made a special study of their popular songs. He drew up a curriculum of study for his pupils, now 150 in number, and was specially happy in the selection of textbooks. And all this was done whilst he was working, at times without a single European assistant, instructing children of no marked capacity, sustained indeed by the cordial support of the English civilians at the station, but uncheered by tokens of obvious success in effecting conversions. Well might the question rise in the mind of an eminent Civil servant 1 at the contrast between the highly educated Fellow of University College and his dusky pupils, 'Is not this a sad waste of power?' Yet more chilling was the frivolous spirit of the people, who met with heartless ridicule and mockery every effort to arouse them to serious thought and every loving warning to flee from the wrath to come.

The day came when the fruit of so much toil, and its result in the unbounded trust and love with which French was regarded by his pupils, proved invaluable. Meanwhile he found refreshment from the weariness of college work by devoting his vacations to preaching in the bazaars and villages. We have to pass over details which give colour and distinctness to French's experience in this—the most ordinary, if the most essential—portion of a missionary's duty. The extreme simplicity of his travelling equipage, the patience and labour with which he delivered his message, the indifference to discomforts under which most men would have succumbed, are minor yet characteristic elements in the narrative, which is relieved by such hopeful incidents as encourage the anticipa-

1 Mr. Raikes, author of Notes on the Revolt.

VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

CC

tion that a great movement may, in God's own time, bring in a large harvest of Mahommedan converts. It might cheer the hearts of some who are working nearer home to read how, in the most unlikely quarters, some were found who were 'not far from the Kingdom of God'; how others, again, beneath the most unpromising exterior, reveal that deep awakening of the Spirit which finds utterance in such phrases as 'My heart is still unripe,' 'Christ must unlock my arms, my lips, my heart'; how the most trifling and apparently most fruitless effort may bring blessing, as in the instance of a darzi who pieced the fragments of a torn tract together, and was led by the study of it to read it to others and to seek and receive Holy Baptism. Amidst such oases in the desert the mirage, too, was not wanting, and some bright hopes vanished like the

morning clouds before the sun.

After six years of earnest labour, French was in a position to take a wide view of Church missions of North India, and to offer valuable counsel on the modification of its missionary strategy. He thought that too much attention was devoted to schools; that the management did not sufficiently accommodate itself to altered circumstances, that it lacked the energy of a boldly aggressive policy, and that it was time to make a fresh start with strengthened forces on true missionary and evangelistic work. As yet, he said, notwithstanding more than twenty years of effort, although the results were not entirely disheartening, 'they impressed him with the sad conviction that what is done as yet was all but play work, not amounting even to scratching the ground.' His letters to the secretaries at home were filled with his anxiety on this account, with his godly jealousy that the Gospel was not holding its rightful place in the extraordinary extension of knowledge throughout British India; that its claims were not more ardently pressed as the one subject of paramount importance on the Hindu mind. It was at the time when such thoughts were uppermost that the English in India were startled by the sudden outbreak which, without a moment's warning, shook their dominion to its foundations, and threatened to overwhelm their civil and religious institutions in universal ruin.

Of all the lessons taught by the Indian Mutiny, this one is writ so large that he may run that reads it: that no bond is so indissoluble as that of a common faith in Christianity to unite those whom all the other circumstances of life—race, ancestral training, alien civilization—tend to keep asunder. Wide as the east is from the west is the chasm that separates

Ori Ind us, o inco

The

1896

before of the strategies of the whole union

clos Gre stat not aske grue peri to t

and

Her

of M revo and runn Ally must all a sions which through the control of the control

(i. 9:

trust

Gove

to th

impl

an.

in

eer

ow,

not

ath

of

art

my

ess

vho

by

eive

ige,

the

osi-

dia,

its

ion

not

hat

hat

on

not-

the

him

but

nd.

his

the

ary

its

t of

h in ut a

ons,

titu-

ne is

nd is

y to

race,

ider.

rates

Oriental from English modes of thought; and if the mind of India after a century's experience be dark and inscrutable to us, our ways, alike of reasoning and of action, doubtless appear incomprehensible to them, in no respect more incomprehensible than in our attitude to the religion we profess to believe. The East India Company in the days of its sovereignty had before it that hardest of political problems, to reconcile a fifth of the human race, endowed with the oldest civilization and literature in the world, to the domination of a handful of strangers from a far distant isle, and it strove, despite many serious mistakes, manfully to solve it. It raised up a succession of unrivalled administrators and brought peace and justice where bloodshed and rapine had prevailed; but for the deeper union of hearts which melts all barriers, it had the prescription close at hand and strangely ignored it. 'Neither Jew nor Greek,' so ran the formula; but so blinded were our English statesmen that they met the first missionary efforts in India, not with the benevolent neutrality which was all that was asked, but at first with open antagonism and later on with grudging acquiescence. Yet in the hour of England's direst peril, at frightful risk to themselves and all that was most dear to them, wherever there was an Indian Christian there was a staunch and a priceless ally.

The incidents of the Mutiny are fully recorded elsewhere, and we are only concerned with French's share in them. Here is a glimpse of his bearing from an active participator

in the struggle:

'I must here pause,' writes Mr. Raikes, in his Notes on the Mutiny, 'to record the impression made upon me by the calmness and coolness of Mr. French. Every Englishman was handling his sword or his revolver. The road covered with carriages, people hastening right and left to the rendezvous at Candaharie Bagh. The city folk running as for their lives, and screaming that the mutineers from Allygurh were crossing the bridge. The budmashes twisting their mustachios and putting on their worst looks. Outside the college, all alarm, hurry and confusion. Within calmly sat the good missionary, hundreds of young natives at his feet, hanging on the lips which taught them the simple lessons of the Bible. And so it was throughout the revolt. Native functionaries, highly salaried, largely trusted, deserted and joined our enemies; but the students at the Government, and still more at the Missionary, Schools kept steadily to their classes; and when others doubted and fled they trusted implicitly to their teachers, and openly espoused the Christian cause' (i. 91).

In the general confusion, however, it was impossible to tell whether any of the natives were trustworthy, and the gravity

cl

ef

as

fe

tic

do

ab

CO

th

ev

fro

du

too

Ch

La

Mi

Ca Bu

Be

All

int

cal

Ha

Fre

800

ord

to F

and

dits

oug

of the danger was appalling. A hundred thousand men. trained under English discipline, had risen in revolt, and were marching upon the English stations; the contingents of some friendly native States were offered us by their rulers, but with the admission that they were not to be relied on; all the rabble of the great towns was unloosed to shoot, burn, and plunder; and the Mutiny in some districts had been accompanied by horrible atrocities. At Agra the Candaharie Bagh, in which the English entrenched themselves, was held by a single regiment of European infantry and a handful of volunteer cavalry and artillery, and it might well be questioned whether it were safe to admit the native Christians within the lines. It was argued that their fidelity at best was doubtful. that they incurred no danger from their fellow-countrymen, that they would seriously overcrowd the fortress; but French insisted on their admission, and prevailed. Next day a further difficulty arose, the Secundra Christians were in imminent peril and begged to be let in. Their request came at a trying moment, when the Agra force had been worsted at Shahgani, and were returning with their wounded; but the country swarmed with rebel troops, and the native Christians were certain to be massacred if they spent the night outside the walls. Once more French pleaded their cause, but the officer in command at the gate refused to acknowledge the commandant's verbal permission to enter, and insisted on a written order. Nor were they finally admitted until French had declared his unalterable purpose to stay out with them if they were refused. Few nobler acts of heroism adorn the annals of a time rich in heroic deeds. It is delightful to add that French's confidence was not misplaced. The native Christians, when admitted, rendered valuable service and were loyal to the last.

We pass over the events of French's next ten years, rife as they are with experiences and plans for further work. As soon after the Mutiny as the road was open, Mrs. French, in sadly weakened health, had been sent home, and a year later her husband was constrained to follow her, hands and feet, eyes and brain, all seriously overtaxed. Three years, crowded with parochial and deputation work, were spent in England, and another twelve months in the mission started by Colonel Reynell Taylor in the wild frontier district of the Derajat; whence, after being found senseless from sunstroke in the jungle, French came, invalided, back again. Five years, from August 1864 to 1869, he held the vicarage of St. John's, Cheltenham, his head and heart the while full of fresh plans

Jan.

en,

ere

me

rith

the

and

om-

igh,

y a

un-

ned

the

tful,

nen,

nch

ther

nent

ring

anj,

ntry

vere

the

ficer

om-

tten

de-

hey

nals

that

nris-

oyal

rife

h, in

later

eyes

vded

and,

onel

ijat ;

the

from

hn's, olans for India. A Training College of Native Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers for North-West India and the Punjab at a convenient centre, and with adequate appliances for turning to the best account all available material for building up a native Church—such was the ideal he had formed, had pressed in a well thought out scheme upon the Salisbury Square Com-

mittee, and was now called on to govern.

It would have been difficult amongst the thousands of the Anglican clergy to have found one parish priest who could have alleged more weighty and conclusive reasons for declining the call. He had a tenderly loved wife and a numerous family, whose education was matter of urgent importance, and all these must be left behind. He had a parochial charge, in which he was so greatly valued that all loving efforts were made to detain him. He had such literary tastes as give clerical life in England a singular charm when it is felt that wide culture may have special sanction by its devotion to the furtherance of the highest ends. He had already done yeoman service in the mission-field, and might reasonably leave new ventures to younger men. More than all, he could have pleaded that his health was too precarious, and that on his leaving Derajat the doctors gave no hopes of his ever being able to go out again to India. Mr. Birks inserts from his diary a list of the authors he had been reading during a life of great activity within a single year, and it is too remarkable to be omitted. They are Homer, Chrysostom, Charles of Bala, Gerlach, Charnock, Hugh Macmillan (Life of Lacordaire), McCheyne, Pusey, Carlyle (Frederick the Great), Milman, Adolphe Monod, Travers Madge, Hengstenberg, Carter of Clewer, Spenser (Faery Queen), Livy, Propertius, Burke (Thoughts on the Present Discontent), Bunsen, Niebuhr, Bengel, Berridge, Fletcher of Madeley, Garratt (on Prophecy). All resistance, however, melted before the conviction that the interests of India are paramount, and that 'My Imperator calls me.' French had induced Mr. Knott, Vicar of East Ham, to join him, and they started together for Lahore. French left behind him eight children, and Knott a living of 800l. a year.

The vision of an English clergyman surrounded by the ordinary comforts of a Western home, from which he sets out to preach with sadly imperfect knowledge of the vernacular, and occasionally to engage in controversy with native pundits, over whom the superiority of his English education ought at least to secure him an easy victory—such, we

<sup>1</sup> See the anecdote quoted from Livy (i. 169).

th

bi

an

of

fu

Н

sta

pe

for

ha

qu

wi he

tio

em

fro

lin

tha

aga

was

to and

and

out

anc

or '

scal

seei

of t

bee

the

with

lies,

thar

to t

spir

ciple

think, is no uncommon conception of missionary life in India. How absurdly it differs from reality is perhaps hardly realized by many who are better informed, and a brief glance at the labour involved in the case of so well furnished a teacher as French may show that the work supplies abundant opportunity for the exercise of ripened scholarship and unwearied toil. Besides the study of the text of Holy Scripture with the students, he carefully worked out a system of divinity framed on the best European authors, English and foreign, Hooker and Martensen, Butler and Dorner and Liddon.

'I do not think,' he writes, 'that many can have an idea of the labour these classes cost. . . With the Mahommedans dogging our steps and scenting out keenly and industriously every real and imaginary difficulty, we cannot do as we would and confine ourselves wholly to the spiritual interpretation. The critical will have its place, and the first years of teaching will require the greatest labour. Then to put it all into intelligible and expressive Hindustani involves further torture of brain and culling of technical words from Arabic and Persian text-books, the Soofic literature, the Vedant and other philosophical systems of the Hindus' (i. 248).

Often, says his biographer, French might be seen in the class-room translating Chrysostom De Sacerdotio, or Augustine De Catechizandis Rudibus, or Hilary De Trinitate, direct from their originals into the native Hindustani. When handling his favourite subject of Church history, he strove to enforce not merely the facts, but their force and value; and he deduced from them lessons of practical value; as he dwelt on the parallels between the early history of the Carthaginian and Indian Churches—parallels much closer than any which could be gathered from the annals of the Anglican communion.

'Augustine's Confessions,' he wrote, 'the whole process of the agonising struggle by which through vices of youth indulged, heresies maintained, and literature and science idolized, and a hundred other rough and crooked ways, as he calls them, God's grace led him on and on to the final victory over self and sin, and made him for so many years the light and pillar of the African Church, impressed the youths greatly; and his later history, too, and his methods and spirit of working as head of that Church, will not be forgotten by them' (ibid.).

The death of a great pundit at Lahore—who, although unbaptized, would look at nothing but the Bible which he had propped up before him, and declared that he would have none but the God of the Bible—recalled the last days of Augustine spent in prayer and reading the Seven Penitential Psalms in-

Jan.

dia.

rdly

ance

ed a

dant

un-

crip-

m of

and

Lid-

f the

gging

and

our-

have

eatest

indu-

words

, the

class-

e De

from

dling

force

delt on

inian

which

com-

of the

eresies

ndred

ce led

le him

scribed on the wall of his chamber. Above all, French desired that his students and the native Christians should continue in all the joyous freedom of their native simplicity, and should

not ape uncongenial European ways.

It was one of French's special characteristics that he combined unwearied assiduity in the work of an evangelist with a statesmanlike grasp of the whole field of Christian policy, and he was able to throw himself with foresight, sagacity, and sympathy into the prevailing mind and prospective necessities At one moment his whole heart and soul were devoted to the salvation of the meanest wayside beggar; at the next they were occupied with far-reaching problems of the future destinies of Christianity among the many millions of Hindustan. He was quick to recognise identity of circumstance under altered conditions, and to gather from the experience of the Primitive Church lessons of deep importance for the welfare of Indian Christianity-lessons which would have been overlooked by one who was less thoroughly acquainted with early Church history, or less deeply imbued with its spirit. As years went on and his horizon widened, he realized more fully the importance of laying the foundations of a Church which, under the blessing of God, might embrace so vast a portion of mankind, deep and broad, free from the trammels of English insularity, and modelled on the lines of Catholic doctrine and discipline. It was in this spirit that he wrote about his own work as follows:

'As regards our training colleges, we must not forget that over against the colleges of Christian learning in the early ages, there was a multitude of hermits living isolated lives in the desert, as like to Hindu Gurus and Sunyasees in mode of life as can be conceived, and with rather less learning, who had an extraordinary influence, and did most of the work that was done in leavening the masses outside the cities, besides their occasional meteoric visits and appearances in the heart of cities at the crisis of some great controversy, or when some plague was raging, and to throw weight into the scales of the Gospel when it was waging an unequal contest, as it seemed. We must be very careful about damaging the work of men of this class, to whom all great religious movements in India have been owing. . . . To such men as I have described, good vernacular theological works, emanating from our institutions, might be helpful, without stunting their growth and repressing their strong individualities. We do not forget to stimulate our students, as far as in us lies, by words and examples to choose rather the Indian Guru's life than the hotbed artificial life of the foreign missionary, and, like him, to try to imbue with seeds of truth and to assimilate to his own spirit and character, as formed after Christ, some one or more disciples, through whom he may stretch out and diffuse widely

sh, imethods gotten gh une had e none ustine ms inChristian influences. . . . I have much hope that there is approaching a stage of native inquiry, at which they will appreciate the fact that the Gospel of Christ has only an accidental, not essential, connexion with the English, and will take an independent stand on the Word of God, not ignoring at the same time the great struggles and controversies through the sifting furnaces of which the Spirit of God has carried the Church in ages long past, and purified and settled its main articles of faith' (i. 250-1).

Whilst holding such bright expectations of the future of native Indian Christianity, French was by no means blind to its deficiencies. He bewailed its lack of discipline and the serious imperfection of much Dissenting missionary teaching. felt with increasing force the imperative necessity for Catholic order and doctrine amongst a people too liable to claim each man's private judgment as his supreme arbiter of truth. He was persuaded that there was no way of escape from the difficult and tangled questions thrust upon them by the unhappy divisions of modern Christendom, save by taking refuge in a Church formed on the primitive model, and that profound piety and personal holiness were essentially connected with the dogma of the Son's eternal glory in the glory of the Godhead. fact is, and we think it a chief shortcoming in Mr. Birks's pages, that he fails to bring so important a truth into due prominence, that French, under the stern teaching of experience, was gradually shifting his ground, not forsaking the Evangelical verities in which he had been nurtured from his cradle, but learning that their highest realization is perfected and sustained by the adoption of Catholic usage.

The growth of such convictions was, however, very gradual, and in 1872 we find French taking the lead in a remonstrance against Ritualistic practices which did not meet with very cordial reception from the Bishop of Bombay, and in which we think French would not have joined in later years. Meanwhile increased attention to the Indian mission-field was making the lamentable deficiency in the Indian episcopate daily more intolerable. On former occasions we have referred to the causes which may extenuate but cannot excuse the scandal of this tardy progress. The Punjab happily lies beyond the region whose spiritual wants are still hampered by legal conditions which it has long outgrown, and a bishopric at Lahore was planned and a sufficient endowment The new see was to comprise the raised early in 1877. Punjab and Sindh, with the whole Himalayan frontier region, and the hill station of Simla, the summer capital of India, and French was selected as the fittest man to undertake its

manifold and weighty responsibilities.

and mai adv in t his Can

189

plan was well his apo fulli

smal

exte

Chu

outp

shou will truth ancie meas prop be n soul. quire mind differ imm in its heart

in the exac insti requ

a pec

move

pyran crowi inwar in the sweet men i father What manner of Church leader he was likely to become, and with what singular combination of the clear-sighted statesmanship and personal holiness of one called to rule at an advanced outpost of the Church militant, may be discerned in the following extract from a paper written shortly before his designation to the bishopric. It was addressed to the Cambridge Mission Aid Society, in furtherance and explanation of the Cambridge brotherhood, of which French was one of the foremost founders, and which resulted in the well-known Delhi Mission. His words illustrate so admirably his ideal of missionary work and character that we make no apology for quoting them with somewhat more than ordinary fullness, although even then in a much abbreviated form:

'I have always been in the habit,' he wrote, 'of looking at my small divinity school in Lahore as a mere miniature of a far more extensive plan, which time and the growth of education and of the Church of Christ in India might give birth to, and which a larger outpouring of the Spirit of Christ on our seats of learning at home should bring to ampler and maturer development. The problem will be, without losing a grain or particle of the great deposit of truth (ή καλή παραθήκη) which has been entrusted to us as an ancient branch of Christ's Church, to present it in its entireness, yet measuredly and gradually, as people can bear it, so that it may be appropriated in a natural process of digestion and assimilation, and may be meekly received as the engrafted word to the saving of the soul. To this you will see that not intellectual powers alone are required, but the power of profound sympathy with various orders of mind, discovery and insight of parallelisms beneath great surface differences, besides a very evenly balanced judgment, and such an immoveably steadfast grasp and clear insight of truth as is supernatural in its origin. Flesh and blood cannot reveal it. Since it is both the heart and mind of a people, of the prime and choicest spirits of a people which have to be acted on jointly, it is evident that such a movement calls for rarely combined qualifications of heart and mind in those who are its instruments.

Then, after describing the Alexandrian schools 'as the exactest and most practical model of a Christian educational institute,' he goes on further to describe the kind of teachers required:

'Men able to realize the Baconian idea of knowledge as the pyramid, with Christian truth, the truth of God, as its apex and crown; men of deep humility, faith, and love, whose experience and inward teaching has convinced them of the Divine power which lies in the Gospel, that everything lives whither the river cometh, that it sweetens the bitterness of men and satisfies their hunger and drought; men too able to occupy the middle position which the Alexandrian fathers occupied, so as rightly to adjust the relations of γνῶσις and

re of to its rious He

holic

each

Jan.

oach-

fact

con-

the

and

God

e was
It and
sions
nurch
and
ogma
The
irks's
due
sperig the
m his

rance very which Meanl was opate ve re-

ected

y lies pered and a ment e the egion, India,

ike its

πίστις as opposed to the wild exaggerations and dreams of the Gnostic on the one hand, and the empty-headed monk on the other who identified faith with ignorance, each in their own way sinking often into grievous depths of profligacy and immorality. It is clear that colourless and savourless character will not do: but men whose influence will tell, search, and penetrate—stay the progress of moral corruption—scribes instructed, κατηχούμενοι, before they can engage in the work of κατήχησις ... Men of that self-renunciation and self-devotion so brightly instanced in Origen, practised in enduring hardness or prepared for it, gentle, tolerant, conciliatory, yet filled with power and judgment and might by the Spirit of the Lord, whose life and character should breathe about them an atmosphere of holiness, who could say with Ignatius "My love is crucified."

They must be qualified also for close and keen investigation of those particular wants of the people they have to deal with, which Christianity is adapted to meet, and the special difficulties they find in embracing it, not looking at it in a superficial way at all, but in their roots and sources traced out to their ramifications and subtle intricate windings of thought, in which Hindus are unequalled, and whose outcome to the light will often take many strange and weary burrowings underground to discover. . . . Hinduism in its Pantheistic forms and Mahommedanism in its Deism, would, I suppose, chiefly be the fortresses against which your attack would be directed . . but this work in India and China is one of the most crucial tests the Church of Christ has ever been put to: the people you think to measure your forces against are such as the giant races of Canaan were nothing to . . . And the greater and harder the enterprise, the sharper and sterner the encounter, the more the eyes of men and of angels, of friends and of foes, are upon you, so much the more humility and worthiness of character and depth and seriousness of purpose, and holiness of life, and fervent wrestling in secret, as well as concerted prayer, and unwavering self-renouncing trust in the supernatural might of God's good Spirit, and the willingness to work long in the dark and in a very small way, are absolutely needed.'

After further insistence upon the necessity for entire self-surrender—this cannot be a shallow matter; it must be deep or not at all—no halves, no *dilettante* work in such a business as this,' French added a caution as to the method of procedure, full of lowly sagacity and strikingly in accord with his own mode of working:

'My counsel would be not to compromise yourselves in any great plan at once, as far as sounding the trumpet goes, and announcing to the world your intention . . . This does not exclude, but rather demands, great distinctness and definiteness of plan. It only works up to its realization out of darkness into light, out of small things into great, and does not start from them. It gives occasion for the work to be begun in silence and secresy and comparative solitude with God.'

Oi field h

paralle
God—
meet t
best se
faithfu
(i. 323

W enter and c 'le ne travai augm the or his fir Matth son o balan thoug emph must stranc Linco sancti Nonc which that t consc of the to th dema perpe Such autho with y respec and l indee kind a of cha qualit fancy. Gnostic ner who ng often ear that whose of moral engage and selfng hard-

led with

ose life

oliness, tigation , which hev find , but in d subtle led, and d weary theistic , chiefly cted . . . tests the hink to Canaan rise, the and of ne more sness of s well as e superork long

entire nust be such a thod of ord with

iny great incing to t rather ly works Il things for the solitude On the point of permanent self-dedication to the missionfield he concluded that vows were better avoided:

'Experience teaches me that the work itself and the wholly unparalleled sufficiency and adequacy of Christianity and the Word of God—not forgetting the Church's great trust and commission—to meet the exigencies and necessities of humanity everywhere, are the best securities and bonds to an honest mind for holding true and faithful to its first offer of itself to do Christ's work in the far East' (i. 323-6).

Within the compass of a review it would be impossible to enter into the details of French's episcopate. He commenced and continued it in the spirit of his quotation from Fénelon: 'Je ne suis pas établi évêque pour rien. Malheur à moi si je ne travaille avec tout ce que j'ai de forces pour conserver, cultiver, augmenter l'héritage sacré que mon Maître m'a confié.' From the outset he steadfastly eschewed all party terms, and one of his first acts was to offer the archdeaconry of Lahore to Mr. Matthews, a High Churchman of the school of Bishop Wilkinson of Truro and of Archbishop Maclagan. He held the balance firmly and impartially between the two sections of thought which the Anglican communion embraces, and emphatically sanctioned a breadth of ritual toleration which must have astonished his co-signatories in the ritual remonstrance. He loyally accepted the Primate's decision in the Lincoln trial, and upheld the lawfulness of the points it sanctioned; whilst he protested against attempts to conciliate Nonconformists by the compromise of a modified episcopate which renounced the succession on the one side, he urged that the clergy should submit to some wounding of their own consciences rather than allow any fairly reasonable member of their flocks to be stumbled on the other. He held firmly to the advantage of private confession when genuinely demanded and discreetly received, and to the lawfulness of perpetual vows for consecrated women of mature judgment. Such views, combined with an uncompromising persuasion of authority inherent in the episcopate, were not welcome to many with whom he had been long closely united, whom he highly respected and dearly loved. But French was a true leader, and knew how to stand alone when needful. One quality, indeed, he lacked of no mean importance to a bishop. His kind and enthusiastic nature was not quick to discern shades of character, and he frequently endowed men with imaginary qualities which had no existence beyond his own too sanguine fancy.

Although Bishop French was not a great organizer, by

means of incessant and self-sacrificing labour he accomplished much valuable work in the diocese. No man ever toiled more conscientiously for solid rather than merely showy At his son Cyril's ordination he urgently advised him not to neglect solid study of the ablest theologians of all Churches and times:

'It is easy and self-exalting,' he wrote, 'to give up quiet thoughtful study and accumulation of precious stock in order to gain the name for great devotedness, and doing double the work another man can. But the work in this way becomes more ephemeral in character, and tells less on classes whom it is most difficult and most important to reach—the educated and literary classes who should not be forgotten -though most of all to the poor the Gospel is preached '(i. 352).

A golden maxim well worthy of remembrance in our own hurried days, and not seldom, we fear, altogether overlooked.

The story of the founding of Lahore Cathedral is a notable episode in the life of its first bishop. The difficulties to be overcome were of no ordinary kind, for there was none of that local feeling which so largely aids church-building at home; the bulk of the residents would have been content with a much simpler structure than French desired; some of them regarded so large an outlay on a material fabric as undesirable, others had Presbyterian sympathies, none were wealthy, and all were looking forward to returning home to England as quickly as possible. But French was not to be discouraged. For thirty years after the occupation of the Punjab the English had been content to worship in the tomb of one who had originally been an Indian dancing-girl, and which afforded very inadequate accommodation. Such an arrangement had long been felt to be a scandal, and 3,000l. had been subscribed towards a church, for which a site had also been secured. French, however, determined that the new structure should be a cathedral in all respects worthy of a great diocese, and obtained fresh plans from Mr. Oldrich Scott for a building of an estimated cost of 50,000l.

The proposal was one at which many Indian Churchmen stood aghast, even though somewhat less than half the outlay could be postponed to a future day. In the pressing need for funds to supply the inexhaustible wants of India, men were ready to cry, To what purpose is this waste? But, although no man realized more fully the urgency of India's religious needs, French was persuaded that it was most important, in the interests of those needs, that the stigma and

reproach of the tomb-church should be removed.

«I in Eng do fee and M be a g I coul handso would and m sacred tomb b of this quite a sure, f

> limits) witnes

> expend

are lea

1896

(ii. 97) In the o unfav transe Churc serve began One s tion o only h comm neous had s to con Gover paid 1

plished r toiled showy sed him s of all

Jan.

oughtful he name nan can. cter, and ortant to orgotten 352).

ur own rlooked. al is a ficulties as none ouilding content some of abric as ne were g home not to n of the in the ing-girl, . Such dal, and h a site ed that respects rom Mr. 0,000%. irchmen half the pressing f India, ? But, India's as most gma and

'I am not surprised,' he wrote, 'that my dear and valued friends in England are disturbed, and I value their kind counsel . . . But I do feel that, in presence of the great religious edifices of heathen and Mahommedans, to erect a mean and unsightly building would be a great disgrace to us and a stigma on the Church of God, which I could not allow my bishopric to be marked by . . . A stately and handsome church in presence of the huts of the New Zealanders would be an anachronism, but in the midst of an architectural people, and most self-sacrificing in what they spend on buildings devoted to sacred purposes, it would be a scandal that we should worship in a tomb belonging to a Mahommedan past. I am thoroughly convinced of this, and am constrained to act on this conviction, even if I were quite alone in my belief. There is much greater necessity, I feel sure, for buildings of character and distinction (within reasonable limits) in this land than in our own land . . . I dare not withhold my witness and that of my office from those who in this country are expending vast sums on schools, law courts, hospitals, museums, but are leaving the house of God to dwell not in curtains, but in tombs' (ii. 97).

In April 1879 an appeal was issued to the diocese, but the outbreak and continuance of the Afghan war were unfavourable to progress, until it was suggested that one transept of the cathedral should be erected for the native Church in memory of Gordon, and that the chancel should serve as a memorial to the fallen officers. Then subscriptions began to flow in, but not by any means in adequate volume. One serious check followed another. A promised contribution of timber from the Maharaja of Cashmere proved worth only half the anticipated value. By a mistake of the finance committee, 4,000l., spent on the foundations, had been erroneously thought to be included in the builder's contract, and had still to be provided. The Supreme Government refused to contribute anything, and would only allow the Punjab Government to help on condition that all the balance was paid up by the end of March 1885. But French struggled on. He proposed to give up his horse and carriage. He crippled himself by the largeness of his donations. He wrote begging letters till his hands were almost paralysed and his strength utterly exhausted. He journeyed to England to gather funds. When the error of the finance committee was discovered the Bishop's distress was acute; for the only remedy seemed to be to ask for loans without interest, and the Bishop 'had never borrowed in his life before, and would starve rather at any time.' Yet gradually light broke and further help came, including 300l. from Canon Liddon; and on the Festival of the Conversion of St. Paul (1887), in the presence of over a thousand worshippers and attended by more than forty of the clergy, the Cathedral of Lahore was consecrated to its high purpose. Throughout the arrangements of the cathedral the Bishop had been most solicitous that the native Church should have the fullest recognition in this the mother church of the diocese; and he fondly hoped that within its storied walls the children of the East and West would join hands in loving rivalry for truth and holiness of life; and that at some future day an English prelate, like a second Chrysostom, might give up his pulpit to some Sikh or Punjabi priest with a large following of wild tribesmen.

The Afghan wars of 1879 and 1880 naturally excited the keenest interest in the diocese of Lahore, and French was much grieved at the insufficient supply of chaplains for the troops, with whose desire to be furnished with them-'and those of the right sort too '-he fully sympathized. He showed in every way how deep was his personal concern for the soldiers. He drew up special forms of prayer to be used not only in camp, but in all churches throughout the diocese during the campaign. He determined to visit in person the British cantonments in Candahar, and persevered in a tedious and chilling march to it through the Bolan Pass, losing no opportunity for ministering by the way spiritual consolation to officers and men. The journey was made through terrible wintry storms, with all the trying detention incident to scarcity of sumpter beasts and badness of roads, but the Bishop bore it all cheerfully. What unbounded love and confidence he won from all ranks in the army need scarcely be insisted on. With the Afghan war medal on his breast, which he so fully merited, were associated in their minds memories of services worthy of the Victoria Cross itself. He was ready at any time to go miles out of his way, under a burning sun, to minister to two or three troopers in their sickness, and he would strip off his coat in hospital to rub the limbs of a sufferer from cholera. No wonder that the colonel in command of the artillery at Meean Meer once said to him. before all the officers at mess, 'If there is a forlorn hope to be led, we will follow you to a man.'

We cannot extend our notice to include an account of French's missionary expedition to Persia in the spring of 1883. He greatly needed rest. He had 4,000/. to collect for his cathedral during a brief visit. But at the request of the Church Missionary Society, conveyed through the Bishop of London, he accepted a commission to visit their mission stations, although he wrote that 'it must involve many heavy

crosse hithe conve to Me He w in He thing spirit Churc zeal,

1896

follow of his Bisho see of the eanswer at such his set this b

Fi

for jus

rest i journe intere spent familia whose imagin vivid 1 French of En Presby which hope o discou his utr he wri

am abl manner widow v a little l He loo impres

contin

ed by

re was

range-

icitous

tion in

hoped

1 West

ness of

like a

sikh or

ted the

ch was

for the

- and

ern for

oe used

diocese

son the

tedious

sing no

solation

terrible

lent to

but the

ve and

scarcely

s breast,

minds

elf. He

under a

in their

rub the

colonel

to him,

hope to

count of

pring of

ollect for

est of the

Bishop of

mission

ny heavy

He

crosses and sufferings, perhaps in excess of what he had known hitherto' (ii. 37). The difficulties, the perils, the scarcity of conversions from Mahommedanism, invested English missions to Moslem lands with a special fascination for Bishop French. He was ready, so far as the way was opened to him, to follow in Henry Martyn's footsteps. He was anxious to see something of Dr. Bruce's work in Persia, carried on as it was in a spirit so congenial to him, of helpfulness to the Armenian Church, without attempts at proselytizing, and of unflagging zeal, rewarded by scant success, in preaching Christ to the followers of Islam. Was he already meditating the devotion of his own remaining days to this hardest of services? Already Bishop Stuart, his former colleague at Agra, had resigned his see of Waiapu to work as a simple missionary in Persia-had the example fired him with a like resolve? We cannot answer these questions; but hardly was his cathedral, built at such excess of toil to him, completed, than he retired from his see, and the interest of his life henceforward centres in this branch of mission work.

French laid down the episcopal crozier which he had held for just ten years at the close of 1887, and left India, to seek rest in the Lebanon. We are unable to dwell upon his journey from Bagdad to Beyrout, and must hasten on to the interesting chapter which gives the history of ten months spent in Syria and Palestine. Although the ground is familiar enough, it is seldom that it has been trodden by one whose combined simplicity of purpose, breadth of view and imaginative sympathy, enabled him to present it with such vivid realization of its actual position and its vast possibilities. French mourned the inadequate representation of the Church of England in many prominent districts where American Presbyterians and Roman sisterhoods were occupying ground which yet leaves abundant opening for more than the forlorn hope of the existing and isolated Anglican effort. However discouraging the prospect might be, the Bishop invariably did his utmost to further it by personal and pecuniary help. Thus he writes from Beyrout, where Mrs. Mott was struggling to continue her schools under almost overwhelming difficulties:

'I am trying to help her a little as out of my reduced means I am able, but India drains most of what I can spare. My quiet manner of life with a dragoman who waits and cooks, and a poor widow who cleans dishes—one dish it generally is—helps me to have a little balance for these causes' (ii, 274).

He looked to a more general circulation of the Scriptures to impress on the Eastern Christians that deeper sense of sin

who

which he felt these friendly and blithe-hearted, but somewhat shallow and superficial, people needed, but the ministration of which through Anglican Church agencies the Roman priests and all the various bodies in submission to the Pope strenuously withstand. On the hill station of Brumana in the Lebanon, whence he paid missionary visits to the villages and monasteries, and where he worked indefatigably at conversational Arabic, he was fully occupied for nine or ten hours a day, speaking for the most part in a strange and difficult tongue; and yet he was able to speak gently of those who said he ought to take some definite post of duty at once, as if his time were spent in idling or self-pleasing! Yet, despite all hindrances, he believed that our Church has a special path of usefulness before it in reviving and evangelizing the Eastern Churches, and it would be well if all Churchmen would ponder and lay to heart the wise and pregnant terms in which one so deeply experienced expressed his mature convictions on this great question.

'The Protestants,' he writes to his son Cyril, 'appear to me to lack a high tone of moral elevation and of devout prayerfulness and self-devotion, making religion to consist too much in correct notions of doctrine as to justification and in resisting all ritual, sacramental, sacerdotal notions as abominations. The temperate views of our Church on these subjects, with its moderate, solemn, searching ritual, and reverent, devout, quiet spirit, encouraging so much the soul's breathing after holiness and close imitation of Christ, seem to be just what is wanted to bring the Bible home to the heart and life in the power of the blessed Spirit, for which it witnesses so sacredly and steadily and with such vivid reality. Both Rome and Geneva will do what they can to prevent the entrance of the Church of England and its influences, and it may not be God's will that we should find admission at present ' (ii. 277).

This conviction greatly saddened French. He felt that the Church was losing a noble opportunity of planting the standard of the Gospel in the land to which then-and yet more emphatically now—all eyes are directed: the land of Greek and Iew, Druse and Moslem and Armenian. To make the slightest contribution to this uplifting of the Cross he esteemed of small account his year's indefatigable fagging at He made every effort to master its pronunciation and colloquial terms. He submitted to any discomfort if it only brought him into close intercourse with those who spoke it, and this visit to Palestine over, after eighteen months of service at home, he set forth again to spend his last months, and then to lie down and die amongst the Moslem people for

dear sixty devo stud work Paul whol mon chief Macl inner which there the p work Chur deter a sac the F so vi of On writin lived great writin

P Kaderi the She some especia intense Him, t spent, exercise culties tion, ar God. across s respect

made n

at long VOL.

(July

an acc

hoods

Jan.

ewhat tion of priests

e stre-

in the

illages

at con-

hours

lifficult

se who

e, as if

despite

al path

ng the

chmen

terms

mature

o me to

ness and

notions

amental,

of our

earching nuch the

seem to

whom, and for Christ in them, he sacrificed all that life holds dear.

It was on no mere quixotic venture that French set out at sixty-six years of age for a new field of action, although his devotion was not crowned by great immediate success. study of languages, and latterly of Arabic, had been his life's work, which he thought should not be wasted, despite St. Paul's comparative depreciation of tongues. He surveyed the whole Moslem mission-field, and, guided by concurrent testimony, he fixed on Muscat as the spot on which it was of chief importance to assail the faith of Islam. From there, Mackay had written, hail the finest Arabs in Zanzibar and inner Africa: it is the key of Central Africa. In Oman, of which Muscat is the capital, General Haig was convinced there were important openings for the Gospel. To occupy the place as unpaid volunteer in a missionary brotherhood, working consciously and more or less in concert with other Church Missions to Africa, was become his life's dream. He determined to go by way of Tunis and thence to Kairowana sacred Moslem city in which for a thousand years before the French occupation no Christian foot had trodden-and so viâ Egypt down the Red Sea littoral and on to the Gulf of Oman. At Kairowan he studied with growing interest the writings of a great Arabic classic, Abd-ul-Kadir, a saint who lived 600 years ago and must not be confounded with the great Algerian guerilla general; and the very last of his writings sent from Muscat, and published posthumously (July 1891) in the Indian Church Quarterly Review, gives an account of this Moslem saint and of the Moslem brotherhoods, from which the following extract is taken:

'Personally, the more interesting to me is the brotherhood of the Kaderiyas or Quadirijas, the closest and most persistent followers of the Sheikh Abd-ul-Kadir. . . . I was accidentally led to a study of some of his works in Arabic many years ago, and was struck especially with the deeper spiritual fervour and mystic devotion and intenser thirst of the soul for nearness to God and fellowship with Him, than one finds in average Moslem works. Most of his life was spent, if his works are genuine and bespeak his true character, in exercises of prayer, piety, and charity; solution of doubts and difficulties; preaching of repentance; exhortation to bear trial, humiliation, and suffering patiently; and to submit implicitly to the will of God. In some of his works, tolerably accessible in India, I came across some passages expressive of homage to, or at least confidential respect for, our Saviour. Further acquaintance with his works has made me feel that these terms of respect, sprinkled here and there at long intervals, are frivolous and superficial enough, set by the side VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

and life sacredly Geneva nurch of that we lelt that ting the and yet land of o make cross he gging at nciation fort if it

o spoke

onths of months,

eople for

of the grossly blasphemous and idolatrous eulogiums he lavishes on the false prophet . . . but it is impossible to doubt that Abd-ul-Kadir was a truly great and remarkable personality, and that what is recorded of him, in its infinite diversity of incident and variety of expression, betokens an unbroken unity and singular uniqueness of character which goes far to account for the excess of homage rendered him over the western portion of the Mahommedan world (ii. 343).

French marked in these restless changes, and in the various brotherhoods springing up amongst the Arabs, indications of dissatisfaction with the teaching of Mahomet and a shaking of his once unquestioned supremacy over the Arab heart. He saw in them a faint presage of the spirit of inquiry which may one day shake the hitherto immovable phalanx of Oriental fatalism.

'Is it too daring a hope,' he asked, 'one which will flit across one's brain and shed a glint and gleam of hope on the heart in happy moments, that, like as the gradual laying to rest of the Arian controversies brought over from the ranks of heresies some who were to be of the stoutest and most practised and inflexible champions of the Christian faith, so from the receding tide of Islam may be gathered back to us, and be associated with us, some of the most strenuous and courageous confederates in the Christian warfare? What might the results be, under God, of the raising up of a Christian Abd-ul-Kadir?' (ii. 345).

To prepare the way for such a contingency, and, should God permit, in some degree to make ready amongst the followers of Mahomet a people prepared for the Lord, was the one supreme desire of Bishop French, and it led him to select for his last missionary enterprise the rocky shore on which Muscat stands. The place may be fitly described as the abomination of desolation; and of its inhabitants, a sea captain who had been asked to describe the manners accustoms of strange people whom he visited, said, 'As for manners they have none, and their customs are beastly.' To this remote city he was accompanied and tenderly cared for on the road by Mr. Maitland, after whose departure he worked on for two brief months as a lonely pioneer, and then, body and brain alike worn out, it was there all alone he died.

Of all the graves with which the wide mission-field of the English Church is so plentifully strewn, none is more pathetic than the place in the English cemetery at Muscat which marks the final resting-place of the first Bishop of Lahore. To realize its pathos, the reader must turn to Mr. Birks's concluding chapters, and few, we think, will read them with un-

self-ius solife, felt ino phave inex wife schoheat for illeand

1896

dimi

had who how outw the

1. 2

A

3. (

4. L

THE and smal towa pleto (i) a tion as f serv

prin

ety of ess of mage orld rious ns of king . He may ental

Jan.

es on

hat is

d-ul-

across happy conere to ons of ay be rfare? ristian hould

t the d, was im to re on ped as a sea s and s for ' To ed for re he then, e died. of the athetic marks To s con-

th un-

dimmed eyes. As we contemplate the unflinching toil and self-devotion of this saint and scholar, his career presents to us some of the darkest elements of the tragedy of human life, the darkest item of all to our mind being this-that he felt intensely that the Church had no want of his service and no place for him, and that but for Africa the world would have been to him a blank wall with no open door. Oh, the inexpressible pity of it! Such a man ready to give up allwife and children tenderly loved, home, cultured society, and scholarly pursuits-and yet no place in the wide world of heathenism to which the Church could point and say, Work for me and for our Divine Master there! Not that French leaned on human sympathy; as an Arab said of him, 'he had altogether done with things of this world.' But for us who sit at home at ease and read his life and its catastrophe, how needful is it to remember that, through and beneath all outward circumstances, 'right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.

## ART. VI.—THE EARLY HISTORY OF DIVINE SERVICE.

1. Aelteste Geschichte des Breviergebetes. Von Dr. F. X. PLEITHNER. (Kempten, 1887.)

2. Histoire du Bréviaire Romain. Par PIERRE BATIFFOL, du Clergé de Paris. (Paris, 1893.)

3. Geschichte des Breviers. Von P. SUITBERT BÄUMER, Benediktiner der Beuroner Congregation. (Freiburg i. B., 1895.)

4. La Mélopée antique dans le Chant de l'Eglise Latine. Par Fr. Aug. Gevaert. (Gand, 1895.)

THE history of Divine Service is so complicated a subject, and combines so many different lines of study, that it is small wonder that so little has been done up to the present towards giving a really satisfactory and in any sense complete account of it. Any such account must at least give (i) a history of the Hours of Prayer; (ii) some such description of the principles of Divine Service as will bring into line, as far as possible, the very various forms which the actual services take, and show how they hang together, in general principle at least, if not in detail; (iii) a treatise on the growth of the Dominical Year and the Calendar; <sup>1</sup> (iv) it must take account of the musical side of the service; and here, as above, the varying contents must be brought into line and classified under some general principles.

The four books, whose titles are placed at the head of this article, have each of them important evidence to contribute; but it cannot be said of any, not even of either of the two which claim the title, that it is a History of the Breviary in

the full sense which we have defined.

The books vary very much: two are French and two are German, and nationality comes out, not merely in the language, but in the whole character. The German books are distinguished by solid learning; Pleithner is a valuable storehouse of patristic passages bearing on the subject of Divine Service, while Bäumer goes with all a Benedictine's fullness over the same ground again, and continues the work down to modern times; his discussion of the authorities is often very valuable, and he does something in the way of bringing evidence into line and making it tell its tale, though we fancy a good deal more might be effected. But, when all is said and done, it is mainly with one class of evidence that he deals—that which is to be gathered from writers, and his book might very justly be called 'A [Literary] History of the [Roman] Breviary.'

The main characteristic of the other pair of books is quite different. It is not that they fail in learning—M. Gevaert has a European reputation for knowledge on the subject of ancient music, which his book quite sustains; Abbé Batiffol is well known in England as a sound scholar. But what distinguishes these books is the power that they show of brilliant suggestion, suggestion which may or may not be justified by a further examination of the facts, but which, in any case, is well worth making and well worth working out. If we were to rechristen Batiffol's book we should be inclined to call it '[Studies in] the History of the

Roman Breviary.'

The history of Divine Service is a sphere which continually widens; the materials available for it increase, partly by new discoveries, partly by employing old but undigested evidence. Two of the new discoveries of the last few decades have profoundly enriched the history—viz. the Canons of Hippolytus and the *Peregrinatio Silviæ*; others, such as the *Didache*, only in a minor degree.

<sup>1</sup> This is, of course, as far as the West is concerned, ground common also to the Liturgy, but not as regards the East in at all the same degree. Aprece and que wheex

be

saf dor ma Sa mo mig wh Bär

via

too

dor

litu

emp whi seco

eve

to s in I som alm

first of th it is is m

men

twee

men gress from

A good instance of the growth of knowledge, due to the better digestion of old evidence, is given in the case of the Apostolic Constitutions; their bearing upon this history has received much illustration from the critical studies of Funk and others, and valuable results have been attained in consequence. It would be hazardous to venture to prophesy whether there is much more new light hidden away in unexplored libraries and languages; it may well be so, but it is safe to say that there still remains a good deal more to be done in the way of extracting evidence from well-known How much may still lie buried in the Acta Sanctorum? How much more might be extracted from monastic rules, and even from two documents which one might expect writers on this subject to know well, but about which we find disappointingly little in the volumes either of Bäumer or Batiffol-the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Breviaries?-to say nothing of Oriental uses. In fact, it is not too much to say that up to the present very little has been done for the history of Divine Service by comparative liturgiology; like all critical work, this is beset with perils, but when rightly used it cannot fail to prove most fruitful in results.

We do not say this by way of complaint, but only to first emphasize the fact that we have not as yet reached anything which approaches to being a history of Divine Service; and, secondly, to point out what an attractive sphere this still, and even increasingly, is for those who have a liturgical bent.

Meanwhile it may be of service to make a bold attempt to summarize very briefly some points which are fully treated in Pleithner, Bäumer, and Batiffol; and, further, to discuss some other questions which are still open, and perhaps as yet almost untouched.

It will be best to begin with the subject which we placed first in the list, which was given above, of some main divisions of the subject—viz. The History of the Hours of Prayer.

This is clearly one of the easiest divisions to work at, and it is the one most fully treated in the books under review; it is mainly a literary question, and the materials for the settlement of it are given very fully by Pleithner and Bäumer between them.

I. The history is a restricted one, and in its main development clear, natural, and intelligible; it is the record of progress from what was merely private to what became public, from what was merely optional to what became obligatory,

lanlanare tore-

Jan.

take

ove,

ified

this

ute;

y in

ness on to very ging ancy said t he l his

y of

ss is

M.
the
ains;
olar.
they

may but worth k we of the

new ence. prolytus only

mmon egree.

not

of t

loca

whi

pra

the

St.

an i

reas

pra

con

cam

min

und

the

trac

mor

was

that

of p

chai

sion

of p

this

conf

eithe

this

deci

more

subj Pleit

be ta

latte

in th

Heri

both

liable

crease

and to some extent also from what was merely occasional to what became continuous,

The hours of prayer have their roots in private devotion: the Jews were familiar with the idea of praying three times a day, as Daniel,1 of praying at midnight, and even seven times a day, as the Psalmist.2 The same is to be seen in the practice of the Apostles, and it continues to be the ideal of the individual Christian, recommended by one after another Thus the Didache prescribes the Lord's of the Fathers. Prayer three times a day; 3 for the use of Terce, Sext, and None there is a long list of authorities beginning with Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Some of them connect the practice with that of the Apostles, some with the Blessed Trinity, while from Tertullian onwards it becomes common to link these three hours with the events of our Blessed Lord's Passion.4 As to the midnight prayer, or Vigil, there is also a long list of authorities, beginning from the same date with Clement and Tertullian.

But this private devotion became public, formal, and even obligatory; the stages, by which it became so, vary considerably in different times and places and under different circum-

stances, but on the whole the history is uniform.

(a) Probably the earliest hour to gain public or quasipublic recognition was the Vigil; but, on the other hand, it was on the whole the last to become a continuous institution, if indeed it can be said to have ever become so. Batiffol shows how deeply the earliest Christian mind was affected by the thought of our Lord coming at midnight (pp. 2, 3), and the expectation that His second Advent would be on the Paschal Night was perhaps not merely part of primitive Christian sentiment, but a Jewish feeling. In any case it seems clear that the Easter Vigil is of primitive origin; it early became repeated as the weekly Sunday Vigil, then as a Saturday Vigil as well, and finally, in due course, by the time of St. Cyprian at latest, it had become customary to celebrate the birthdays of the Martyrs by a public vigil; for St. Cyprian's biographer mentions the coincidence that such a vigil was being kept by the Church on the night when St. Cyprian was himself martyred.<sup>5</sup> But an all-night or even a midnight service did

4 See the passages collected in Pleithner and Bäumer.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Dan. vi. 10. <sup>2</sup> Ps. cxix. 62, 148, and Ps. cxix. 164. <sup>3</sup> Didache, § 8.

<sup>5</sup> Vita Cacilii Cypriani, § 15 (ed. Härtel, iii. p. cvii.) There is far earlier evidence for the keeping of Martyrs' days in itself, e.g. Martyrium Polycarpi, § xviii. (ed. Lightfoot, ii. 980), but then the service, no doubt, was the Liturgy.

nal to
otion;
times
seven
in the
leal of
nother
Lord's
t, and
with
onnect
blessed
non to
Lord's
is also

Jan.

d even nsiderircum-

e with

quasiand, it itution, shows by the the ex-Paschal aristian as clear became y Vigil Cyprian rthdays grapher kept by himself vice did

ere is far artyrium no doubt, not become a daily institution till far later; like all the rest of the public services, its development was much affected by local circumstances, by the lull or the storm of persecution,1 and so forth; and in this case there were also special reasons which militated against the night service becoming the daily practice of the ordinary Christian: the zeal which it involved, the danger of scandal and abuses which made it necessary for St. Jerome, in 403, to caution Læta against letting her daughter an inch away from her at the Vigil Service 2—these, with other reasons which will readily occur to anyone who has had practical experience of such midnight services nowadays, all combined to retard the progress of the Vigil. A new spirit came into it from monastic life, for here the dangers were minimized and the facilities largely increased; consequently under this influence the number of vigils was multiplied and the form or forms of service systematized. We shall have to trace later on some steps in the evolution and progress of the monastic Vigil; for the present it is enough to point out what was probably one main result of the monastic influence, viz. that the Vigil became more a service with an organized course of psalmody, and consequently lost somewhat of its earliest character as a service of simple Bible reading, with only occasional psalms interposed between the lessons.

(b) The morning and evening services equally grew out of private devotion. Both Pleithner and Bäumer <sup>3</sup> agree that this had become public by the end of the second century. We confess to being not so entirely convinced that the evidence either of Clement of Alexandria or of Tertullian establishes this: the evidence of the Hippolytean Canons <sup>4</sup> settles it decisively with regard to the morning service, but we desire more evidence about the evening service: and on the whole subject of this section we desire more knowledge than either Pleithner or Bäumer gives us about two forces which have to be taken into account, viz. the Statio and the Agape.

Each of these is a very early Christian institution, the latter well established in Apostolic times, the former attested in the District and exposured with the property of the content of

in the *Didache*, and expounded with unexpected comments in Hermas.<sup>5</sup> In Tertullian's time, when information becomes

¹ Persecution was a force which in the case of the Vigil operated in both directions; a night service was more suspicious if known, but less liable to discovery; persecution might therefore either increase or decrease vigils. See Tertullian, De Fuga, § 14.

Hier. Epist. 107 (7): but then Paula was to be very strictly brought up! Pl. p. 79; B. p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Whether Canon xxi. be genuine or not: see below.
5 Didache, § 8; Hermas, iii. Sim. v. cap. i.

ser

cer

this

ind

coa

leas

whi

nar

the

mo

dai

and

had

fore

On

beh

mei

serv

som

dev

exp

eve

of t

gate

bee

bec

cen

thei

Prin

to l

plac belo late

that Isid

Ache seem

is di

xxvii

eithe

plentiful, it ended with the Liturgy and Communion; but it is difficult to imagine that this was its earlier form; it seems most likely that any public service which was closely involved in it would belong more directly to the Liturgy than to Divine Service; 2 but this distinction is a perilous one to draw, as at least in form many parts of Divine Service were very closely allied with the Missa Catechumenorum in the earliest times. The Statio closed at the ninth hour with some service; it seems quite likely that this was originally a Missa Catechumenorum, and that it was subsequently developed in two different directions. In one case it made the most of the Eucharistic connexion which it naturally possessed, and so, by the addition of the celebration of the mysteries proper, it grew into the full service of the Liturgy; while in the other case it made nothing of its connexion with the Eucharist. but became a model for Hours of Divine Service.3 If this were so, the Statio would then turn out to have had a powerful influence on Divine Service; in any case the question needs working out.

The Agape had probably a more obvious and direct bearing on the evening service; it seems likely that it tended to become less liturgical rather than the opposite as time went on; the common meal became more exclusively prominent, and the common prayers less conspicuous; but the Agape as described by Tertullian ended, when the lights were brought in, with Bible reading and singing; ' it would not be very hazardous to see in this passage some connexion between the Agape and the Lucernarium-ceremony of the evening service. Moreover, the same connexion recurs in the Hippolytean Canons, in which it is provided that the Agape shall take place at the time of lighting the lamps ('tempore accensus lucernæ'); that the deacon shall rise to light up, then the bishop 'opens with prayer,' and before the guests disperse

psalms are sung.5

1 De Oratione, § 14 (18). At Jerusalem at the end of the fourth century, Silvia notes that there was no *Oblatio. Peregrinatio*, p. 61.

Though it is probable that indirectly the *Statio* affected the latter

as well as the former-e.g. in the way of causing the hours to be kept in

public instead of in private.

Apol. § 39.

<sup>3</sup> These two lines of development were seen side by side at Jerusalem in Holy Week in Silvia's time; on the first three weekdays the None service led on to *Lucernarium*, but on Maundy Thursday it ended with Oblatio.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Canon xxxii.; Achelis, §§ 164-8. Compare Canon xxxiv. and Achelis, §§ 177-182.

but it seems volved han to one to e were in the r with nally a reloped nost of ed, and proper, in the charist, If this

Jan.

the bearded to be went minent, gape as brought be very eservice. Dolytean Ill take ccensus ten the

power-

nrth ceni. he latter kept in

lisperse

erusalem ne None ded with

xiv. and

Clearly here is a public service, an evening service, and a service in which the lighting of the lamps is a prominent ceremony. We desire more information as to the bearing of this upon Vespers; we are inclined to think that the two are independent in origin and idea, but did in fact ultimately coalesce. The suggestion is only made tentatively, but at least it is supported by the Gallican Regula incerti auctoris, which distinguishes Vespers and Compline from Lucernarium.

It is clear, then, that these two public services existed by the end of the second century; besides, at Rome it seems the morning service at cockcrow had arrived at being both a daily institution and an obligation incumbent on the deacons and priests. If this is so, it was a step in advance of what had been attained elsewhere in these two respects, and therefore we are inclined to look with suspicion on the evidence.2 On the other hand, with regard to evening service Rome was behind the rest of the world, as these canons contain no mention of it, unless indeed (as we have suggested above) the service in connexion with the Agape be of that nature. some such irregularities, accelerations, and retardations in the development, as evidenced in various localities, are both to be expected and constantly to be found; the daily morning and evening service certainly did not become general till the end of the fourth century, and did not become in any sense obligatory on the clergy till the idea of the clerical status had been revolutionised by contact with monasticism.

(c) The little Hours of Terce, Sext, and None were becoming public services in the East at the end of the fourth century. St. Basil prescribes them in his Rule, and we find them gradually winning general acceptance. With regard to Prime, it is commonly said that the origin of this service is to be found in Cassian's account of a change which took place at Bethlehem in his own time. We shall give reasons below for rejecting this view, and Prime seems to us to be a later development than Compline, and perhaps formed on that model to be a Chapter Service, not a Choir Service. St. Isidore's Rule 3 speaks of Compline, but no Prime, while the

See Holsten, or Migne, P. L. lxvi. 995.

§ 7. See Holsten, or Migne, P. L. ciii. 555 sqq.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The twenty-first Hippolytean Canon is accepted as genuine by Achelis, § 217; but, apart from the suspicions expressed in the text, it seems to contradict other canons; for elsewhere (Canon xxvi. § 226) it is distinctly implied that there is no daily service. Compare also Canon xxvii. § 245, which speaks of the public morning service, but not as being either daily or obligatory.

beco

und

Ser

pray

rou

Sec

regi

ciat

ther

The

imp

whi

kee

of n

the

by

pass

go (

grea

Ser

app

sam

in i

othe

the

selv

that

all t

case

prin

are

unit

fron

case

vice

pass

the

epod

it w

of I

over

is a

Regula Tarnatensis 1 does the converse, though, as the description given there of the services is not a complete one, it would be hazardous to argue that Compline was unknown there. The most probable theory is that both services were monastic and Italian in origin; there is no difficulty at all in seeing how Compline grew out of the private devotions of the faithful. St. Basil recommended the saying of Ps. xc. at night, and there are other signs of night prayers; but the first definite mention of the service is in St. Benet's Rule. It is there spoken of as a well-known service, and it was probably part of the current Roman monastic service,2 and spread from Italy to other countries. It seems to have made its way into Gallican monasteries in the beginning of the sixth century, for it is mentioned in the Rule of Aurelian, but not in the Rule of St. Cæsarius, from which Aurelian derived his liturgical directions almost verbatim.3

Both Prime and Compline existed before the codification of the present Benedictine or Roman course of psalmody, and Prime would seem to have been then a service which was in no way inferior in position to the rest, since St. Benet, in his arrangement, ordained that the Psalter should be begun at the Prime of Monday. On the other hand, they seem to be subsequent to, or independent of, the existing course of lessons, since in both cases the chapter is a fixed one, and independent also of the series of collects. Both these hours were only adopted slowly into secular use, and did not come into general secular use till Carlovingian times.<sup>4</sup>

This outline of the History of the Hours of Prayer seems to show a striking uniformity existing in various parts of Christendom; some part of this uniformity, no doubt, was due to processes of assimilation, but by far the greater part seems to be due to spontaneous movements in various places arising out of a common liturgical instinct, and issuing, more or less independently, in the same uniform result.

II. If this is true, we are encouraged to go a step further in search after uniformity of instinct, aim, and execution. It

1 § 9. See Holsten, or Migne, P. L. lxvi.

<sup>3</sup> See the longest rule of St. Cæsarius in *Acta Sanctorum* of Jan. 12; i. 730 in the edition of 1643, or ii. 12 as quoted by Bäumer, p. 150.

4 Gevaert, p. 161.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Baumer's attempt to identify the Columban *initium noctis* with Compline can only be described as chaotic; he rejects as untenable the view that St. Basil's service  $r\bar{\eta}s$  νυκτὸς ἀρχομένης can be connected with Compline; but when the same service reappears in Gaul, he pursues the opposite tack, thereby throwing into confusion the whole of the triple character of the Vigil: see below.

Jan. 1896

scripyould there. hastic g how l. St. re are on of as a arrent other llican it is of St.

cations
cation
y, and
yas in
in his
un at
to be
rse of
e, and
hours

seems rts of t, was r part places , more

urther n. It

ble the ed with ues the e triple

an. 12;

becomes increasingly clear that there are some main principles underlying the great number of varying forms of Divine Service. There is first of all the desire to consecrate with prayer certain hours of the day; we have hitherto been roughly sketching out the growth and outcome of this desire. Secondly, there is the desire to say the Psalter through in regular course, but without prejudice to the practice of associating special psalms with special hours of prayer. Thirdly, there is the desire to read the Bible in some sort of a course. These two latter form a pair of forces which is of such prime importance that it may be said to have determined the form which the hours of prayer were to take; given the desire to keep 'hours,' the actual services become naturally some sort of methodical arrangement for singing the psalms and reading This may be done according to a fixed course, or by some principle of selection which assigns appropriate passages to various times and seasons. We may therefore go on to point out a fourth underlying principle, which, to a greater or less extent, exists in every scheme for the Divine Service, viz. a desire to commemorate special seasons in an appropriate way.

Now the first of these four has found expression in the same way everywhere-the hours of prayer have come to be in the main the same throughout Christendom. But the other three have found expression in very different ways in different places—the course of psalmody, the lectionary and the calendar vary to a bewildering degree. If we ask ourselves how much unity underlies this diversity, it is clear that, as we have seen, there is a unity of principles on which all the variations rest: but is there anything more? case of the Liturgy there is not only an underlying unity of principle observable in all the various services, but as they are confronted with one another there is clearly visible also a unity of form—a skeleton at least of an early type of service from which all have sprung. Is any such thing at all the

case with Divine Service?

At the end of the fourth century in the East, Divine Service had reached a very definite shape; and not only so, but it passed over to the West to profoundly influence, if not to be the model of, future developments there. At this particular epoch we are exceptionally well provided with information; it will be worth our while then to try to sketch out the form of Divine Service which was current in the East, and passed over into the West at the end of the fourth century; if there is any primitive type to which the varying forms of Divine

Service can be traced back, here is our best chance of finding Our main authorities are the Peregrinatio Silvia,2 the Apostolic Constitutions, and the Institutes of Cassian, with a number of patristic passages drawn from St. Basil, the pseudo-Athanasian writer of the De Virginitate, and others. are well discussed in Bäumer and Pleithner, and most of the passages are given at length in one or other book; but we venture to think that neither writer has done what might be done to bring together in one picture the various details, and in certain places we must venture to differ from the views expressed by either of them.

The series of services began before dawn: psalms were sung either responsorially or antiphonally,3 and each psalm was followed by a collect: at daybreak special mattin psalms were sung and the service closed with an Ektene or Litany and collects. Such seems to have been the general outline, though the details varied. At Jerusalem the monazontes and parthena formed the backbone of the congregation, but the service was not distinctively monastic: the clergy as a body only joined in at daybreak, when they accompanied the bishop as he came to close the service in a form analogous to the preanaphoral part of the Liturgy, viz. with the prayer and blessing of the catechumens and penitents, and then the prayer and blessing of the faithful.4 The clergy had no part in the 'Nocturn' before daybreak, except that some priests and deacons were present to say the collects at the close of the psalms.

In a definitely monastic establishment there was no bishop available as at Jerusalem or Antioch or Cæsarea; but the psalmody seems more definitely organized: the traditional custom of the monks of Egypt was to sing twelve psalms; they were allotted to either two, three, or four brethren to say; the rest sat and listened, and at times responded; pauses

<sup>1</sup> There are obviously some forms of Divine Service which stand quite alone, and which we cannot expect to range under any common type, e.g. the Coptic Service.

A study of this document, Les Eglises de Jérusalem, &c. (Paris: Librairie H. Oudin) has recently been published by Dom Cabrol, the Prior of Solesmes. We have found ourselves at variance with the learned author on many of the important points.

At Cæsarea the psalmody was preceded by 'a general Confession,'

St. Basil, Ep. ad Clericos Neocæsarienses, 207 (63), § 3.
<sup>4</sup> This closing of the service was more elaborate on Sundays; three psalms with their collects were said in turn by a priest and deacon and some other cleric respectively, the church was censed, and the Bishop read the Resurrection Gospel. The psalms were, very possibly, Benedicite, Magnificat, and Gloria in excelsis.

1896 were r a pros

Tv usuall this wa but at unless the da This, 1 is to g a vigil in the them, group, Laude variati Biblica

Weste

Churc.

point

will b

by the

service

Th in its having exercis the sec as cho of mon mornin were n the Li

Th it also rium p priate antiple Jerusa of the and th various

Th Vesper 1 Ps

Jan. 1896

inding s,2 the with a seudo-They of the

ut we ght be s, and views

a were
m was
s were
y and
chough
rthenæ
ce was
joined
came
phoral
of the
lessing

bishop ut the itional salms; iren to pauses

cturn

(Paris: orol, the learned

fession,

s; three con and Bishop y, Benewere made at intervals in the psalm; each psalm ended with a prostration and a collect, the last with Alleluia.

Two lessons were read at the close of the group of psalms, usually one from the Old Testament and one from the New; this was the daily habit among the monks and at Cæsarea also; but at Jerusalem it does not seem to have been customary, unless indeed we are to suppose that Silvia found it in the daily service, but passed it over as needing no remark. This, then, as a form of service is clear enough; the difficulty is to give it a name. It seems to us to be quite distinct from a vigil: it began in the early morning and ultimately issued in the Matutinæ Laudes, or Matutinos ymnos, as Silvia calls them, which began at daybreak; these are evidently a fixed group, and included Ps. l., Ps. lxii., Ps. lxxxix., and the alvor or Laudes, Pss. cxlviii.-cl. This group of psalms is with some variation the same all the world over: it included also Biblical canticles, such as still remain unchanged in the Western services of Matutinæ Laudes, and in the Orthodox Church in the form of the nine great Scriptural Odes. point of unanimity is an important one to seize hold of. It will be best to call any service which contains this group by the double name of Mattin-lauds, and the whole of this service may be described as Nocturn plus Mattin-lauds.

This service seems to be double not only in its form but in its origin; the first part of it has all the appearance of having been originally a more or less informal devotional exercise of the *religious*, both men and women, prefixed to the secular office of the bishop and clergy, and such lay folk as chose to join them; or, in other words, it was a course of monastic psalmody serving as a prelude to the common morning prayers of the Christian community in general, which were modelled upon the outline of the preanaphoral part of

the Liturgy.

The evening service was analogous to this morning service: it also consisted of two divisions; the first part was the Lucernarium proper—the ceremony of lighting the lamps, and the appropriate psalms: when this was done, other psalms were sung antiphonally, and the service closed as in the morning. At Jerusalem this latter part was, as before, the special function of the bishop and clergy: it consisted of the deacon's litany and the bishop's general prayer, and the dismissal of the various classes of worshippers, as in the morning.

This service may best be described as Lucernarium plus Vespers; it agrees with the theory propounded above as to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pseudo-Athanasius recommends Benedicite and Gloria in excelsis.

the composite character of the evening service; and it is further noticeable that it is this latter part which was repeated in Jerusalem by the bishops at the shrine of the Cross on ordinary days, after the whole has been said at the Anastasis.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from this pair of double services, the other hours of prayer were Terce, Sext, and None. At Jerusalem the former was kept only in Lent,<sup>2</sup> in fact the public use of them seems to be just becoming general; the service as described by Silvia follows closely the lines of the morning service. The Egyptian monks did not meet for service at these hours; Cassian describes and justifies the Palestinian monks who did; St. Basil recommends it where possible.

We have already explained that the Vigil was a quite different service from the daily morning service described

above as of the Nocturn plus Mattin-lauds type.

It was a triple function and lasted on from nightfall till the morning. This period was divided into three spaces—the beginning of the night, the middle of the night, and before dawn. The service consisted of antiphonal and responsorial psalmody, with lessons at intervals. Silvia describes in general terms the vigils kept on the Fridays in Lent, and in greater detail the vigils of Maundy Thursday and Good Friday; the Easter Vigil she passes over as being the same as was customary in Gaul, with one slight exception of detail in the baptismal service. Cassian describes the Friday Vigil as universally observed; in each of the three divisions three psalms are first to be sung antiphonally, and then follow three psalms sung responsorially, with three lessons interspersed.

This is clearly quite a different service from the morning

service:

(i) The latter was in form at least an innovation at the end of the fourth century; Silvia describes it as new;

<sup>2</sup> Bäumers statement on p. 106 n. is inaccurate; the contrary is

rightly stated in the text on p. 118.

3 This triple division seems to have been a monastic modification of the old παννυχὶς, fervigilium; theearliest evidence is in St. Basil's Rule (c. 37); the actual all-night watch obviously could be kept only occasionally, and this threefold watch formed a suitable substitute for it.

<sup>4</sup> The details are not so fully given by Silvia or Cassian; the reason probably is that all were agreed how to keep a Vigil, and there was little new to tell or prescribe, except that Cassian urges that time should be left for an hour or two of sleep before the morning service.

St. B book are ba Vigil

1896

proba part of by th

later the m nor w in fac occasi in the

T

passed

centu difficu the re menta which at Ro which Gelasi with 1 stance genera tical a more toms ! but th those

of this to We will traced (ii) the groupe

1 Si

and w

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In Holy Week *Lucernarium* is said at the Martyrium, and the latter part with a psalm repeated at the Anastasis. *Peregr.* p. 64, s. fin. An obvious correction in Gamurrini's punctuation is needed so as to read 'Lucernarium etiam agitur ibi'; see Duchesne's *Origines*, p. 485, where an amended text is given.

Jan. it is 1896

eated ss on tasis.1 hours n the them

ribed rvice. ours; who

quite cribed

before
usorial
eneral
reater
riday;
as was
in the
gil as
three
three

at the new;

sed.

ne latter in. An to read 5, where

ation of l's Rule ly occaor it. e reason

e reason ere was should St. Basil defends it as a novelty; it comes into the eighth book only of the Apostolic Constitutions; the others, which are based on earlier documents, know nothing of it. But the Vigil is well known and well rooted everywhere.

(ii) The time of the two services is clearly different.

(iii) The triple division is peculiar to the Vigil; it seems probable that when there was a Vigil, it superseded the first part of the morning service, and consequently was followed by the Mattin-lauds at daybreak.

(iv) More conclusive still is the fact that neither now nor later was the Vigil proper a daily service; it was not so in the monasteries which Silvia visited on her way to Jerusalem, nor was it so in Gallican monasteries as late as St. Ferréol; in fact, we shall see that the Vigil continued to be only an occasional service till it either disappeared or became merged in the daily Nocturn Service.

This Eastern scheme of Divine Service seems to have passed bodily over to the West at the close of the fourth century; how far the West had any fixed scheme before, it is difficult to say. The Vigil was clearly well established, but the rest of the hours of prayer seem to have been in a rudimentary state. We can, perhaps, distinguish two main causes which brought the Eastern customs westward. (1) The council at Rome in 382, where many Eastern bishops assembled, and which St. Jerome also visited: this was presided over by Pope Gelasius, whose name is, by a very early tradition, associated with liturgical development; and, even apart from this circumstance, it seems natural that such a gathering should lead to general interchange of ideas, especially on a subject so practical as daily worship. (2) The influence of Cassian is a far more tangible cause of the introduction of the Eastern customs to the West. His direct influence mainly touched Gaul, but there it was very great, and the great monasteries of those provinces owed a very large proportion of their rules and ways to his practical knowledge of the monasteries of Egypt and Palestine.

III. It is important to try to discover what modifications of this scheme came about in consequence of its introduction to Western Christianity. Now, if we may be venturesome, we will hazard a conjecture: viz. that there are here to be traced three formative elements—(i) the all-night Vigil; (ii) the Catechumens' Liturgy; and (iii) the prayers which grouped themselves round the Agape—which three types of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Silvia, p. 39, s.f. <sup>2</sup> See his Rule, § xiii. Migne, P. L. lxvi. 959 sqq.

service have done the main work in forming the various Orders of Divine Service. The influence of the latter we have already traced in evening service; the Catechumens' Liturgy seems to have been the form which is mainly traceable in the little hours, and in the latter part of the morning and evening services; the Vigil service went on to a certain degree intact. Later, as we have already stated, it seems to have been modified into a definite triple form undermonastic influence, and we must go on to trace how it underwent great modification and became allied with the morning service of Nocturn.

Probably the first step taken in this direction was the alteration recorded by Cassian as having been inaugurated at Bethlehem in his own time. In order to make it impossible for the monks to sleep on after the morning service till the third hour, it was found desirable to have a service at the first hour. It is generally stated that this was the origin of the service of Prime; but this is misleading. It certainly was the origin of a service at daybreak; but it is clear, from Cassian's account, that the service said then was the latter part of the morning service—i.e. that the result of the change was that the morning service was divided into two parts: the original matutina was divided after the Laudes (Pss. cxlviii.—cl.), and an altera matutina was prescribed for use at sunrise which included the Psalms l., lxii., and lxxxix., which had followed Laudes in the original matutina.

it is much more like the differentiation of Mattin-lauds from Nocturns. We venture to suggest that this is what actually took place in Italy, at least, so that the normal service of every day became a Nocturn service with a Mattin-lauds service appended to it, and the latter included the Fifty-first and Sixty-third Psalms, with the addition of the Laudes, which at Bethlehem had formed the close of the Nocturn service. Further, we may hazard the theory that this Nocturn service came to be may hazard the service of the service of the largest that the service of the largest largest that the service of the largest larg

It seems erroneous to describe this as the origin of Prime;

may hazard the theory that this Nocturn service came to be regarded as a vigilia, not in the full sense of the all-night vigil of Easter, nor even in the sense of the triple monastic function which developed out of the *Pervigilium*, but in a more restricted sense as a service in the early morning preceding the dawn; that this became a daily monastic service, but when the occasional real Vigil of the primitive or the monastic type occurred, it absorbed the daily Nocturn service.

It is service but o

the to

of the

I

1896

Franchise in Franc

T

distinuere throuside higher that a secular and firmona throuse change change.

It special the ear of the private Psalm use as in oth which Laude kerne able v

1 S i, 220,

VOI

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cassian tells us that the innovation passed over to the West (*Inst.* iii. 4), but that the arrangement of Lauds psalms was different in Gaul, since the Pss. cxlviii.-cl. closed the Mattin-lauds service (*Institutes*, iii. 6).

Jan. 1896

rious r we nens' ainly f the

on to ed, it under nderrning

s the

rated nposce till ce at origin tainly from latter hange : the lviii.-

unrise

rime;
from
y took
y day
ended
third
lehem
er, we
to be

to be -night onastic at in a g pre-ervice, or the ervice.

st (*Inst.* n Gaul, es, iii. 6).

It is even possible that this may be the reason why the night service of Italy came to be on ordinary days a single Nocturn, but on great days a matter of three Nocturns derived from the triple vigil.

It will be best, however, to speak more fully about some of these suggestions, and, in fact, to make an attempt to trace the main lines of development in greater detail in Spain, France, and Italy; but, before entering on this, something must be said about the second and third of the main principles which were pointed out above, and which will now meet us at every turn—viz. the cursus, or regular course of psalmody, and the scheme of Bible reading. Both these two principles come to be such essential elements in the problem of the development of Divine Service, that a few general remarks must be made about them before attacking the main problem.

There are two methods of using the Psalms, clearly distinguishable even in early times: (i) special psalms were selected for special use, and (ii.) the psalter was said through, more or less, in course. The two methods existed side by side, and the relation of one to the other is subject to great variation, though, on the whole, it may perhaps be said that a definite course is more akin to the monastic than to the secular spirit, and that in many cases its existence as a fixed and formal thing may be found to be more or less due to monasticism. The early solitaries said their psalter straight through in larger or smaller portions, and, as the hermit life passed into the coenobitic life, this characteristic went on unchanged.

It is clear from Eusebius <sup>2</sup> that the principle of selecting special psalms for special occasions was well established by the early part of the fourth century. It was, no doubt, part of the heritage which the public services took over from the private hours of devotion; e.g. the early attested use of Psalm lxii. at Mattin-lauds was probably preceded by its use as part of the Christian's private morning prayer. But in other cases it was only the public character of a service which made the use of a special psalm appropriate; e.g. the Laudes (cxlviii.-cl.), which, from the earliest time, form the kernel of the morning service, are clearly selected as a suitable vehicle for a corporate act of daily praise.

We must therefore expect to find these two principles at

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See the account of Nilus in Pitra, Juris Eccl. Grac. Hist. et Mon. i. 220, and Bäumer, p. 127.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See the quotations in Bäumer, pp. 58, 59.

work at every turn in the development of Divine Service, and in very varied relation one to the other, as sometimes the idea of the course preponderates, sometimes the idea of selection. As to the method of Bible reading, it seems clear that the early lessons either followed the line of the Prophecy. Epistle, and Gospel in the Liturgy or were more or less continuous readings from books of the Bible; that is to say, that they, too, were sometimes special lessons and sometimes a course. The reading of the Resurrection Gospels on Sundays is a clear instance of the former; examples of the latter are probably a later development, but are seen most definitely in both the Cæsarian and the Benedictine regulations about ordinary days.

We must now hasten on to trace, though it be only in a very summary way, the course of the development in the West of the type of Divine Service which came over from the East towards the end of the fourth century. The movement seems to have gone on with great vitality; the monastic spirit was always ready to adapt to its own use and ideals the forms and methods which it received, and the secular clergy were unwilling to be left behind in this stream of progress.1 The result is a general cry for more uniformity. It reaches us from Spain, at the Councils of Girone (550) and of Braga (circ. 563); 2 from Gaul, at the Councils of Vannes (465) and of Vaison (529); and what these councils were trying to do for the secular office the various monastic rules were doing for convents.

If we turn first of all to Spain, we find in the Rule of St. Isidore 3 an account of the service of the seventh century,

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the efforts of the secular clergy in Spain, recorded in the 7th Canon of the Council of Tarragona (516), and in Gaul at Vannes (465); see Bäumer, p. 153. *Op.* Canon 4 of the first Council of Saragossa (381); and Justinian's Edict (530), Bäumer, p. 157.

The second canon of the Council of Emerita (666) has a curious

provision as to uniformity in the order of Vespers; Bäumer's exposition

of it (p. 172) seems very doubtful.

The passage is not quoted in Bäumer:

'Recitantibus autem monachis post consummationem singulorum psalmorum prostrati omnes humi pariter adorabunt celeriterque surgentes psalmos sequentes incipient. . . . In TERCIA SEXTA et NONA tres psalmi dicendi sunt, responsorium unum, lectiones ex veteri novoque testamento duæ, deinde laudes hymnus atque oratio. In VESPERTINIS autem OFFICIIS primo lucernarium deinde psalmi duo, responsorium unum et laudes, atque oratio dicenda est.' . . . Compline follows. . 'In QUOTIDIANIS vero OFFICIIS VIGILIARUM primum tres psalmi canonici recitandi sunt, deinde tres missæ psalmorum quarta canticorum, quinta MATUTINORUM OFFICIORUM. In Dominicis vero diebus vel festivitatibus martyrum solemnitatis causa singulæ superaddantur missæ. Verum in

which psal and little beco unit tina, no m and out t Vest as at the i bisho

1896

the p their in a The muc three of ps of a fastservi suetue

form

tantu ciii. 5 sugge true o more (ii) a

quotic

(Mare series of the Divin factor

ing. to be to oth evide which and the electhat necy, consay, imes Sunatter defitions

Jan.

only nt in from novenastic deals ecular bro-It nd of annes were rules ule of

Gaul at incil of curious osition ulorum ue sur-NONA

ntury,

corded

ERTINIS nsorium WS. . canonici , quinta itatibus erum in

ovoque

which shows that much of the old type remained. Each psalm was followed by its collect and a prostration; Saturday and Sunday retained their old distinction; the lessons at the little hours were still retained; the morning service had become divided into two, but had not altogether lost its unity. The first part (Nocturns) formed a daily Vigilia matutina, and was followed by a Mattin-lauds service. There is no mention of a proper all-night or triple Vigil, but on Sundays and festivals some compensation was made for this by filling out the Vigilia matutina with additional groups of psalms. At Vespers the Lucernarium still has its definite place, and there, as at the little hours, the intercessory suffrages survive under the name of Laudes,1 though there is no dismissal by the bishop.

This order is evidently a halfway-house between the old form and the existing Mozarabic Services. There, though the psalms are reduced almost to nothing (except in Lent), their collects survive. The lessons survive, though also often in a reduced form at Mattin-lauds, Terce, Sext, and None.2 The morning service, 'Matutinum cum Laudibus,' is still much in the state in which it is described in Isidore, with the three fixed psalms (iii., l., lvi.), and the relics of three groups of psalms, the canticles, and Laudes.3 There are the remains of a course of psalms (more distinctly visible in Lent and fast-days) which extended over the Mattin half of morning service, Terce, Sext, None, and Vespers-that is, Prime and

VIGILIIS recitandi aderit usus, in MATUTINIS psallendi canendique consuetudo. . . . Post VIGILIAS autem usque ad MATUTINUM reficiendum est. . . . Lectiones autem ex veteri et novo testamento tempore officii quotidianis diebus recitentur, Sabbati autem die atque Dominico ex novo tantum pronuncientur.'-Regula Sancti Isidori, cap. vii. Migne, P. L.

ciii. 566.

This identification of Laudes with the Preces, or suffrages, is only suggested with great hesitation: it is a very strange use of the term if a true one; but the position of the Laudes seems incompatible with any of the more usual meanings of the term-as, for example, (i) Pss. cxlviii.-cl., or

(ii) a group of psalms with Alleluias.

They survive also in another form in Morin's Liber Comicus (Maredsous, 1893), especially in Lent, where there is a regular triple series for Mattins of Sunday, Terce of Saturday, and None of all or three of the remaining weekdays. See also a set for Litany-days, pp. 309-31.

The data available for forming any judgment upon the Mozarabic Divine Service are very insufficient: Ximenes' Breviary is very unsatisfactory; Lorenzana's marks a distinct advance, but is often quite misleading. The British Museum MS. Add. 30851 is full of interest and deserves to be published, though, as it is certainly monastic in origin, its relation to other Mozarabic services is not simple: there seems to be in it clear evidence of the keeping of the genuine triple Vigil with a set of services which in general character are not unlike the Gallican Vigil services.

thi

(iv

otl

KI

sei

an

in

tw

(iii

Ma

and

aft

Ps.

(Co

Be

Gl

Ky

ant

tan

see

its

say

bal

the

sha

and

on

ma

the

is !

a d

riu

it i

i.e.

cou

is de

the

Aur

Compline have no real status. There have been considerable additions—e.g. Kyries accompany the Capitella, or suffrages, and, in accordance with the tenth canon of Girone, the Lord's Prayer follows them, while hymns have established themselves in defiance of the Council of Braga (543), by virtue of the permission of the Fourth Council of Toledo (633). There has been even more considerable dislocation and abbreviation; but, on the whole, the old type is very markedly preserved.

For the Divine Service in Gaul there are much more ample materials: on the monastic side we have the three Rules of St. Cæsarius, the Rules of St. Aurelian, St. Donatus, St. Ferréol, and St. Columban: we have also the precious Bangor Antiphonary, the first real service book available for our purpose. From these we can form a fair idea of the general outline of the Gallican monastic services in the sixth and seventh centuries. The Latinity is crabbed, and the technical terms are employed in the most arbitrary way, with different meanings in different systems; also there are plenty of obscure points which need further investigation, but a combined picture may still be worth attempting, and will prove of service to our purpose.

The traditions of Cassian were carried on by St. Cæsarius, who definitely founded his rule on the customs of Lerins, and by St. Aurelian, whose liturgical prescriptions are

evidently drawn from St. Cæsarius.

The Vigil was kept daily in Easter week, but at other times normally only feria sexta and Dominica: the year was divided into two periods, winter and summer (dating from Easter and October 1); in summer the Vigil was made up of a prolongation of Duodecima and Nocturn, but in winter there was a second Nocturn service added. services were not continuous themselves, but the intervening spaces were filled up with missæ—that is, groups of lessons and psalms; each missa consisted of three lessons, each closed by a collect, and at the end of the last collect an antiphonal psalm, a responsorial psalm, and another antiphonal psalm. After Duodecima there were six missæ; after a Nocturn service there were two in winter, but three in summer. On Sundays, however, always, there were six missa after a Nocturn service. These missæ were so calculated as to fill up the time and lead straight on to matutini or Mattin-The form of service was the same for Duodecima or Nocturn, and consisted of (i) Psalmus directaneus; (ii) eighteen psalms said in six groups—a group consisting here, as elsewhere, of two psalms, recited by two of the brethren, and a

XUM

rable rages, ord's selves f the e has tion;

more three natus, ccious ilable f the the bbed,

trary

there

red.

ation, g, and arius, erins, s are

other year lating made ut in These ening essons each ct an antiafter

missæ
ted as
attinna or
hteen

elseand a third called *alleluiaticum*; (iii) three antiphonal psalms; (iv) a hymn and two lessons, one from the Apostle and the other from the Gospel; (v) the *Capitellum*, or suffrages. *Kyrie eleison* was said thrice over at three points in each service, the beginning and end, and after the group of psalms, and so bound the whole into one.<sup>2</sup>

The little hours of Terce, Sext, and None<sup>2</sup> were alike in plan, but differed in scale; each contained (i) psalms—two or four groups; (ii) one or more antiphonal psalms; (iii) hymn and one or more lessons; (iv) Capitellum. The Mattin-lauds service consisted of a group of select psalms and canticles without lessons; on Sundays and festivals, after a psalmus directaneus (e.g. Ps. cxliv.), there followed Ps. xlii. (Judica me Deus), lxii. (Deus Deus meus), cxvi. (?) (Confitemini), the Song of Moses (Cantenus), Ps. cxlv.-cxlvii., Benedicite and Ps. cxlviii.-cl. (the Laudes); then Magnificat, Gloria in excelsis, or Te Deum, and the Capitellum and Kyrie eleison twelve times.<sup>4</sup> The psalms were sung with antiphons on ordinary days and with alleluia on Sundays.

Lucernarium, or Vespers, consisted of (i) psalmus directaneus, (ii) three antiphonal psalms, (iii) hymn; and it seems possible that this led straight on into Duodecima, but its relation to Compline would then not be easy to determine.

The main feature which we miss in this outline is the saying of the collect after each psalm, though it would probably be rash to conclude that because it is not mentioned therefore it did not exist. The little hours keep their early shape; the Nocturn service is distinct from Mattin-lauds, and is, apparently, not a daily service; the Vigils are kept on Friday and Saturday and festivals; and, while the provision made for filling up the night with service is new and peculiar, the old object is effectually obtained. The chief difficulty is to account for the service of Duodecima: it seems to be a daily service, and perhaps to be connected with Lucernarium; but in form it is identical with a Nocturn service, so it is, in all probability, the first division of the Vigil service, i.e. the service Ad initium noctis of the Columban rule. The course of psalmody seems to extend over every service except

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We place these all under one number, as the position of the hymn is doubtful.

See the Council of Vaison (529), canon 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prime seems to have followed the same plan, but it does not hold the position of the other three. Compline is mentioned only by Aurelian.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Aurelian gives a second form for ordinary days, which is shorter. <sup>5</sup> See the Regula Tarnatensis, vi. Migne, P. L. lxvi. 980

ch

m

qu

sp

m

gi

sta

tic

pr

fro

se

sa

re

- th

A

as

ho

sa

bo

tr

de

th

CC

of

of

th

of

no

(1

W se

D th

re

Mattin-lauds; we are expressly told that the antiphonal psalms of a missa are taken in course, and the same is

probably true of the regular groups of psalms.1

There is also on ordinary days a definite course of Bible reading at the Vigil, but at other services the lessons follow more or less the triple order of the Catechumens' Liturgy, and even at the Vigil on Sundays or festivals special lessons are read, the Resurrection Gospels on Sundays as at Jeru-

salem, and Passions of martyrs on their festivals.

We have been obliged to go at length into these Gallican services because they are so much neglected in Bäumer; the later monastic ordinances of Gaul have suffered in the same way, but we need not deal so fully with them, as they have been lucidly expounded in a recent number of this Review.2 It is enough to say that from the Rules of St. Columban and St. Donatus 3 a very full account can be gathered of the Vigil, and from the Bangor Antiphonary a clear idea of Mattin-lauds, with other additional information.

The former is still triple; it is, in a sense, a daily service, though much enlarged and amplified on a Vigil proper. consists of three services: (i) Ad initium noctis, said at nightfall, and probably equivalent to the Cæsarian Duodecima; 4 (ii) Ad medium noctis, a similar service at midnight; (iii) Vigilia matutina in the early dawn, and perhaps

like the second Nocturn service of Cæsarius.

The latter service varied in length according to the season and according to the day of the week; for ordinary nights the year was divided into two halves, summer and winter; eight choræ, or groups of three psalms each, were sung in summer and twelve in winter; in this St. Donatus and St. Columban agree. They differ, however, as to the noctes sacræ, i.e. Saturdays, Sundays, and festivals; they each divide the year into four parts, and prescribe a maximum of twenty-five choræ in winter, beginning from November 1, but for the summer minimum St. Columban prescribes twelve

daily Nocturn service was prescribed. Migne, P. L. lxvi. 954.

Vol. xxxvii. No. 74, Jan. 1894, pp. 337-63. This is much to be preferred to Bäumer's account, which is meagre and erroneous.

 Migne, P. L., Ixxxvii. 296, and ff.; not quoted in Bäumer, but see
 Antiphonary of Bangor, pt. ii. p. xiv.
 The term Duodecima is used in the Columban Penitential, where it seems equivalent to the service Ad initium noctis. See Holsten, Codex Reg. folio edit. i. 174. It is unfortunate that Warren, in the meagre account of these services prefixed to The Antiphonary of Bangor, pt. ii., identifies it here with Vespers, pp. xiv n., xvi and n.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Rule of St. Ferréol, § xii., prescribes that the psalms should be said in course, though apparently only in public on Sundays; here a

iphonal ame is

f Bible follow iturgy, lessons at Jeru-

allican äumer: l in the iem, as nber of ules of nt can onary a mation. service. oer. It said at n Duot midperhaps

season nights winter; e sung us and noctes y each num of r I, but twelve s should ; here a

ch to be , but see

al, where Holsten, e meagre or, pt. ii., choræ, St. Donatus fifteen. In both systems provision is made for a gradual diminution in the psalms in the spring quarter till the summer minimum is reached, and a corresponding increase during the autumn quarter, but their method is different; and, while that of St. Donatus is intelligible and complete, that of St. Columban is less clearly stated.2 The Columban rule gives only a general description of the day hours as made up of three psalms and their preces: if we turn to the Bangor Antiphonary, we have not only two specimens of what these preces were, but the materials from which it has been possible to reconstruct the Mattinlauds service more or less completely.

We thus get a fair idea of, at any rate, the chief Columban services: the course of psalms seems to have been mainly said at the Vigilia matutina; the day hours have been reduced in importance, but in the absence of all mention of the lessons, except the Gospel at Mattin-lauds in the Bangor Antiphonary, we cannot guess what was done in general as to a course of reading, nor even as to whether the little hours still kept their lessons. It would also be difficult to say whether the psalms still kept their collects; the Bangor book shows that the canticles did, and probably the same is true of the psalms; though the Columban Penitential, in describing the prostration at the end of each, speaks only of the threefold repetition of Deus in adjutorium, &c., not of any collect. It is important also to notice here the first appearance of independent collects, relating, not to a particular member of the service, but to the service in general.

St. Columban, while advocating the system of adapting the course to the length of the night, describes another existing course which was invariable: it consisted ordinarily of twelve psalms, said at four different times-(i) Ad initium noctis; (ii) Ad medium noctis; (iii) Ad gallorum cantus; (iv) Ad matutinum; while on noctes sacræ thirty-six psalms were said Admatutinum. This disregard of the variations of season St. Columban considered too rigid to be desirable.3

1 This is necessarily implied in all the calculations of addition and subtraction, except in one passage where we would read Quindecim for Duodecim; the whole is then clear, and the Saints' days fall into line with

the Saturdays and Sundays.

<sup>2</sup> His statement that at the equinoxes the services were alike must refer to the holy nights as well as the ordinary nights. This is inconsistent with the remark that the subtraction begins at Midsummer. We should perhap read 'viiiº Kal. Oct.' for 'viijº Kal. Jul.' which would make St. Columban's divisions the same as St. Donatus's, but still leave a difficulty about the rate of addition and subtraction.

3 Compare Regula cuiusdam patris; Migne, P. L. Ixvi. 987.

Jan.

1896

pro

psa

we

Luc

the

Glo

seci

scar

tha

or l

eve

Cap

Sec

Ma

crea

sun

as i

the

lau

cl.),

vice

or (

acc

Gu

tha

foll

Div

evi

the

Re

whi

cus

out

Mo

psa

thir

Fle

Ital

son

The elaborate provisions of the Regula Magistri¹ deserve separate mention, for they stand quite by themselves, and seem to represent a Gallican form of monastic service, which has been a good deal influenced by the Benedictine Rule. The course of psalmody was most definite; it varied according as it was winter or summer. At the night service, which seems to be single, not triple, there were in winter thirteen antiphonal and three responsorial psalms; in summer nine antiphonal and three responsorial. Each psalm ended with Gloria and its collect; the psalms were said singly, but might be grouped in threes, provided that they were not curtailed.

At Mattin-lauds six antiphonal psalms were said (i.e. Ps. l., Pss. cxlviii.-cl., and four canticles), one responsorial psalm, and what is probably a Gospel canticle; the same at Lucernaria in summer.<sup>2</sup> At the lesser hours of Prime, Terce, Sext, None, and Compline, three antiphonal psalms and one responsorial psalm were said. With regard to the psalms, it is noticeable that all the psalms at every hour are to be said currente psalterio. Elaborate distinctions are drawn as to which are sung with and which without alleluia; this varied with the season and with the day.3 Each psalm was accompanied with what is called impositio, i.e. prostration for prayer, and the number of these is elaborately (but often inaccurately) added up in the interests of symbolism. The night service began with a Versus apertionis (clearly Domine labia mea aperies), said by the abbot; each service ended with what is called rogus Dei, probably another name for the Capitella, or suffrages; Compline had further a Versum clusorem. lessons were read, one from the Apostle and one from the Gospel, at every service, and these were preceded by a

This scheme has many Gallican features, and its origin is also shown by the evidence of two fasts, which are mentioned incidentally: (i) the *Centesima pasche*, which began immediately after the Epiphany, and made the keeping of an octave impossible; (ii) an eight days' fast before Christmas. At the same time it has adopted a good deal from St. Benet's rule. Perhaps another proof of lateness of date is to be found in the

1 Migne, P. L. Ixxxviii. 943.

<sup>2</sup> The provisions for *Lucernaria* in winter are very puzzling and contradictory. It is worth noting that *Duodecima*, or *Vespera*, is also spoken of clearly as the equivalent of *Lucernaria*.

<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to note a *Psalmus refectionis* and a verse used at table; the form was *directaneus* on ordinary days, but sung with an antiphon or with alleluia on Sundays and festivals.

Jan. eserve

s, and which Rule. varied ervice, winter

ended y, but re not

Ps. l., psalm, ne at Terce, one re-s, it is e said as to varied ecom-rayer, ately) ervice mea hat is

hat is illa, or Two n the by a

gin is ioned iately e im-

d con-

sed at th an protest which it makes against the curtailment of the psalmody. One instance has already been quoted, but, further, we are struck by a provision that at Nocturns, Mattins, and Lucernaria responsorial psalms are to be said in full; but at the little day hours they may be cut down to two verses and Gloria.

Before leaving Gaul a word must be said as to the secular services, though the evidence about these is very scanty. From the Council of Agde (cxxx. 506) it is clear that the use of the psalm-collects, said either by the bishop or by priests, still continued,1 and also that the morning and evening services ended, as in the Eastern forms, with the Capitella, or suffrages, and dismissal by the bishop.2 The Second Council of Tours (567) enjoins the cursus Sancti Martini, a system of psalms for use ad matutinum, which increases from six sets, of two antiphonal psalms each, in summer, to ten sets, of three, in December, the same principle as in the Columban rule. St. Gregory of Tours speaks of the Vigil as an occasional, not a daily service, and of Mattinlauds as containing Ps. l., Benedicite, the Laudes (Ps. cxlviii.cl.), and the Capitellum. Terce and Sext became public services at Tours only circa 540; there is no mention of Prime or Compline, nor even of None. There is also an interesting account of the service of the Vigil of St. Justus by King Gundebold at Sarbiniacum, circa 510.3 From all this it is clear that the Gallican Divine Service, whether monastic or secular, followed very closely the old Eastern pattern.

When we turn to Italy we find a very different state of Divine Service, exhibiting far greater variety of use. It is evident that at Milan there has been the Eastern influence; the analogy between the Ambrosian and the Columban services of Mattin-lauds was pointed out in the article in this Review which has been already quoted. In another article, which bears traces of the same hand, a full and valuable discussion is given of the Ambrosian Services, and it is pointed out how there are survivals of the lessons of the little hours at

¹ These were probably much the same as those still existing in the Mozarabic Service [v.s.]. Some of them are still to be found in French and English psalters. See Brit. Mus. Tib. C. vi., and Stowe 2, Anglo-Saxon psalters of the eleventh century; Harl. 2895, a Flemish psalter of the thirteenth century, with a different series, and Addit. 18297, also Flemish of the same date, but with a third series, mainly like the common Italian series printed by Thomasius (Opera, ed. Vezzosi, ii. or iii.), but with some differences.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Bäumer, p. 153. <sup>3</sup> Migne, P. L. lxxi. 1155; Bäumer, p. 161.

<sup>4</sup> Church Quarterly Review, vol. xxiii., No. 45, Oct. 1886, pp. 83-112.

the

this

rea

has

plir

set

Luc

psa

tion

ma

old

give

the

oth

of

diti

nev

La

new

mai

COL

not

the

has

the

the

inq

are

evic

sch

pur

all

Roi

Son Ber

som

as

feat

not

a p

turi

Terce in Lent, when lessons are read from Genesis and Proverbs, as in the Mozarabic Services; but in the main the Benedictine course of lessons has been adopted, though ill suited for the purpose. Similar signs of assimilation are also pointed out in the case of the course of the psalms. This formerly was confined to Nocturns of the five ordinary days of the week; a decurion, or group of ten, was said at each Nocturn, so that either, as the writer suggests, the psalter was said through once every three weeks, or, as we venture to suggest, three decurions were said every day, and so the course was completed every week. The existing system is a mutilation of the old one, due to the influence of the Roman or Benedictine course, and to the desire (as we submit) to cut down the Nocturn service. The connexion of the Nocturn service (whether single or triple) with the Vigil or the Nocturn part of the Eastern order of service is too obscure to follow out, but something may be made out about this connexion at Vespers. When the present Ambrosian Vespers has been relieved of the accretion of psalmody, &c., with which a corrupt following of the Roman or Benedictine course overburdened it, there remains a short service, like the Isidorian service to some extent, which definitely opens with the Lucernarium, like the Eastern evening service, as described, e.g. by Silvia. The Ambrosian little hours have been replaced by the Roman model, only leaving, as we have already noticed, the shrunken remains of their former lessons.

Other survivals of the old Eastern model are noticeable in the dignity ascribed to Saturday and Sunday, as implied in the course of psalms; the use of the collects connected with the psalms at Lauds and Vespers, which is all the more remarkable because in the former case the collect precedes its psalm; but the latter do not belong to the psalm in the intimate way in which the Mozarabic psalm and collect are connected. They are appropriate to the occasion, and therefore represent the same tendency which, both at Milan and at Rome, imported the special collects of the day or season

from the Liturgy into Divine Service.

Finally, we come to the Roman and Benedictine forms of Divine Service, and find ourselves almost in another world. The same hours of prayer are kept, and the Vigil has become a night service of three Nocturns, superseding or coalescing with the daily service of one Nocturn. There is a definite scheme of Bible reading, which is probably in its origin Benedictine, but lessons have practically survived only after

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cp. St. Austin, Ep. 36 (86), esp. cap. xiv.; Migne, P. L. xxxiii. 151.

d Proain the ugh ill are also This ry days at each ter was ture to so the stem is Roman ) to cut Nocturn or the obscure his conpers has which a e oversidorian ith the scribed, een realready

beable in plied in onnected the more cedes its the in-lect are dilar and r season

forms of er world. become balescing definite s origin aly after xxxiii. 151.

the Nocturns; at other services there is only a chapter, and this, which seems formerly to have been in many cases a reading of the Epistle in small sections throughout the day,1 has become gradually even more restricted. Prime and Compline rank on a level with the other little hours, but the whole set have been reduced in scale, while Vespers has lost its Lucernarium connexion, but has acquired Magnificat; the psalm-collects have entirely gone, but by way of compensation the collects of the Liturgy have been introduced, and been made a prominent differentiating feature of the services. The old relation of the course of psalms to the special psalms is given up; instead of a course which runs on at one or more of the hours, independently of the fixed psalms appointed for other use, we have now the fixed psalms taken as the point of departure, and the course adapted to them. The old traditional associations are kept and made the foundation of a new system: thus, e.g. Pss. I., Ixii., and the Canticles and Laudes remain at Mattin-lauds, Ps. xc. at Compline, but a new arrangement is made for the little hours, and, more remarkable still, the series of psalms for the Nocturns do not comprise the whole Psalter, but only such parts of it as are not already appropriated as special psalms; in other words, the course, instead of taking the first place in consideration, has had to take a subordinate one, and play second fiddle to the fixed psalms. These main characteristics belong alike to the Benedictine and the Roman service. When we begin to inquire into the differences between these two systems, we are engaging on a difficult task which is obscure for want of evidence.

It seems clear that St. Benet took the current Roman scheme in its broad outline, and modified it to suit his own purposes: the Benedictine course of psalms, for example, has all the marks of being 'a new and improved edition' of the Roman course, in which the groups of psalms are more evenly divided, while each keeps the old rule of the twelve psalms in some form or another. On the other hand, no doubt, St. Benet's improvements reacted on the Roman scheme, and some were even adopted into it—e.g. the Hymns, and perhaps, as Bäumer suggests, the Invitatory. Also some ancient features have survived in the Benedictine Service which are not in the existing Roman Service, though they probably had a place there formerly—e.g. the psalmus directaneus of Nocturns and Mattin-lauds, or the ancient hymn Te decet laus which we have not met with since the Apostolic Constitutions,

<sup>1</sup> See the so-called Durham Rituale (Surtees Society).

While the early Benedictine Service is sketched in St. Benet's rule, we have to look in vain for independent testimony as to the Roman Service of that date. Cassiodorus omits Prime from his list of the seven hours, though he has Compline, and calls the Vesper Service Lucernaria; but this testimony is, perhaps, more monastic than secular.1 formula of the Liber Diurnus 2 is later, though it has preserved an early feature which has since disappeared out of the secular breviary, viz. the lengthening of the psalmody of the Vigil service on ordinary days in the winter months. It is most tantalizing that at Rome, where innovation was boldest. and where both in the case of the Liturgy and Divine Service the most radical changes were made in the primitive type of service, evidence should be so entirely wanting as it is with regard to the motives and methods of such a revolution.

But while the Roman group of services has diverged widely from the Eastern order, it has done so on most practicable lines, and especially we owe to the Roman genius, as it seems, the great wealth of special services which is the glory of Western worship both at the Liturgy and at Divine Service.3 There is very little evidence how this came about. M. Gevaert's book has claimed a place in this article mainly on account of a few pages in which he classifies the antiphons of Divine Service chronologically; he shows that all the earliest antiphons are drawn from the psalms which they accompany, and this class he dates between the years 440 and 540.4 Secondly, a new series of antiphons were composed from the middle of the sixth century onward, which drew their words from parts of Scripture other than the Psalms, and these tended to displace the older and simpler style of Psalm- and Alleluia-antiphons. Finally, a third category must be taken into account, comprehending antiphons which drew their words from non-Biblical sources-Acts of Martyrs and the like—and these did not come into the service till after St. Gregory's time.

This classification has much to recommend it, but we quote it here, not in order to vouch for its complete accuracy,

<sup>2</sup> Batiffol, p. 46; Bäumer, p. 206.

3 In the East the variation is mainly confined to the Divine Service, and is probably of later growth there than in the West.

but feati stead

little

1896

Italy sugg Serv influ

the Cou first and in r mor which the hard artic Bäu imm Serv Bäu is, a but accu of w have othe

> mor plea in s ting buil wild

lega

in th

piec inde

prim musi

<sup>1</sup> We use the terms in their later technical sense, in spite of the fact that the secular Breviary is largely the product of the basilican monks in Rome, and therefore, in a sense, monastic.

<sup>4</sup> This, of course, includes Alleluiatic Antiphons, which are of very early date, and were much more extensively utilized in the early days than later.

Jan.

n St.

testi-

dorus

e has

this

The

erved

f the

f the

It is

ldest,

rvice

pe of

with

erged

prac-

us, as

s the

**Divine** 

bout.

rticle

ssifies

shows

salms

n the

were

ward,

than

npler

third

anti-

ces-

to the

it we

uracy,

he fact

onks in

ervice,

of very

y days

but as a valuable indication (true, at any rate, in its main features) of the sort of development which was going on steadily in the Divine Office in Italy, but of which we have so little external evidence.<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, taking the evidence from Spain, Gaul, and Italy, there seems considerable reason for maintaining our suggestion to be true, viz. that the Eastern type of Divine Service which arose about the end of the fourth century, and passed from thence over to the West, had a considerable influence on Divine Service throughout Western Christendom.

Dom Bäumer begins his second book with St. Gregory the Great, and it includes the mediæval period down to the Council of Trent. We have only been able to deal with the first section—that is, with less than one third of his History and have latterly diverged considerably from his lines, both in method and conclusions. It seemed important to treat more fully the non-Italian Western schemes of Divine Service, which he has left on one side, and to treat more summarily the Benedictine, which he has treated in detail. It will be hardly necessary to remind our readers that, though this article does not pursue the subject into the period which Bäumer defines as the Middle Age, yet this period is full of immense interest and importance for the history of Divine Service; and we would assure them that they will find Bäumer an invaluable guide in carrying on the subject. There is, as we have already stated, a good deal which we look for but do not find in the book; and it bears signs both in inaccuracy and incompleteness of detail, references, index, &c., of wanting the final revision which the author would doubtless have given, if health and life had allowed. But God willed it otherwise; and as it is he has left to the world a valuable legacy, not only of a blameless life and example, as is shown in the touching memoir prefixed to the volume, but of a solid piece of scholarship and historical work, not more valuable indeed in the sight of God than his example, but at least more wide-reaching so far as men are concerned.

Our effort in this article has been hazardous. We must plead guilty to a good deal of theorizing, but can only claim in self-defence that, at least, we have done our best to distinguish between the facts and the theories which we have built upon them; and if that is done, theories, even if rather

wild, are not without their value.

We do not wish to seem to undervalue M. Gevaert's book; it is of prime importance to the History of the Divine Office, but mainly on its musical side, with which we are not now dealing.

## ART. VII.—THE PRESENT ASPECT OF THE CONTROVERSY ON DIVORCE.

1. The History of Marriage, Jewish and Christian, in Relation to Divorce and Certain Prohibited Degrees. By HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean of Lichfield. Second Edition, enlarged. (London, 1895.)

2. A Charge delivered by the Right Reverend Father in God Edward, Lord Bishop of Lincoln, to the Clergy and Churchwardens of his Diocese, at his Fourth Triennial Visitation, held in October and November, in the Year of Our

Lord 1895. (Lincoln, no date.)

3. The Examiner Examined; or a reply to 'A Brief Examination by the Rev. H. W. Reynolds of the York Report on Divorce.' By the Rev. C. N. GRAY, Helmsley. (York, 1895.)

WE do not propose, after our lengthy investigation of the subject last year, to attempt any exhaustive treatment of the historical or theological aspect of Divorce; but the discussions which have now for some time been going on and the present state of the public mind seem to us to call for a summarized account of what may be regarded as the outcome of the controversy on several points, such as may be useful to some for whom, from one cause or another, it has not been possible to study the details of the extensive evidence, or who wish for a guide in considering them.

A favourable opportunity for this task is afforded us by the publication of the second edition of the Dean of Lichfield's History of Marriage. In the course of the article on Divorce, to which we have already referred, we had occasion, in entirely accepting the main conclusion of Dean Luckock's work, to criticize a few of the statements which the first edition contained. That some parts of the second edition have been carefully rewritten, in view of criticisms offered by ourselves and others, makes it appropriate that we should, at the same time, call the attention of our readers to this new edition of an opportune and useful book, and endeavour to ascertain if there are reasons for in any way modifying the opinions we expressed last year. In the preface to the second edition the Dean writes thus:

'The position which I have taken upon myself to aid in defending has been unexpectedly attacked by some prominent Churchmen.

Cand form Rey

in a
Chu:
hold
in th
critic

learn to a and unno disagread own Scrij clear preta

rewr

evid

cons

with that seen after caus is ar omit levar

how he is made evice tie such

this Cha which of it at w

mak of th

<sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review, April 1895, Article 'Divorce.'

Rela-By

E

Jan.

God urchisita-

ifield.

minaort on York,

of the of the discusid the for a coutiay be it has ensive

by the infeld's ivorce, ntirely ork, to n cone been reselves same tion of train if ons we edition

defendchmen. Canons Bright and C. Wordsworth have written, especially the former, at length in the columns of the Guardian. The Rev. H. W. Reynolds published a scholarly criticism on the evidence of Origen in a separate pamphlet. An able article was also written in the Church Quarterly Review for April on the subject of Divorce, upholding the absolute indissolubility of marriage save by death, and in the course of it the writer frequently noticed this History. His criticisms, however, touched only details of the evidence.

'All the above writers can claim a hearing by reason of their learning and authority, and I have given the most careful attention to all that they have said. Their criticisms were based upon a fair and legitimate examination of what I had written, and I hope it is unnecessary for me, as I have had no object in writing on such a disagreeable theme but the attainment of truth, to say that I have readily and thankfully accepted correction in any case where my own judgment seems to have been at fault. I have rewritten the

disagreeable theme but the attainment of truth, to say that I have readily and thankfully accepted correction in any case where my own judgment seems to have been at fault. I have rewritten the Scriptural evidence; not, however, for correction, but to make it clearer than before, that I only put forward the ante-nuptial interpretation of the sin of πορνεία in St. Matt. v. and xix. as a possible solution of what is necessarily a very great difficulty. I have also rewritten and enlarged certain portions of the Patristic and Conciliar evidence, removing two or three passages which I had brought into consideration, as some thought, unfairly, inasmuch as they only dealt with divorce for less causes than adultery. I am far from admitting that the use which I made of them was a wrong one; for it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that a writer in condemning remarriage after divorce for other reasons, would, if he allowed it for the graver cause, have most probably said so. At all events, as I believe there is ample evidence to prove the case without, I have not hesitated to omit any testimony that lies open to a possible objection of irrelevancy '(Preface, pp. xix-xxii).

We shall have occasion, in the course of our article, to say how far it appears to us the Dean is justified in the opinion he has thus expressed, that, when all due allowance has been made for any criticisms which may rightly be offered of the evidence by which the indissoluble character of the marriage tie is maintained, there is no reason for modifying belief in such indissolubility.

We have placed second in the list of books at the head of this article a recent *Charge* by the Bishop of Lincoln. The *Charge* contains statements on other matters than that with which we are at present concerned, but a considerable part of it is taken up with the subject of Divorce; and the decision at which the Bishop has arrived is thus stated:

'I am unable to accept the conclusions of those who would make marriage absolutely indissoluble, and so forbid the remarriage of those who have been separated under any circumstances' (p. 42).

We hope we shall not be thought to be wanting in respect either for the episcopal office or for the personal character of the Bishop of Lincoln if we state with some degree of plainness the impressions which his arguments have made upon us.

The Examiner Examined is a spirited reply by the Rev. C. N. Gray to the attack made on the Report on Divorce of the Committee of the York Convocation by the Rev. H. W. Reynolds. To parts of its contents it will be necessary for us to refer later. In recognizing that Mr. Gray has a grievance, we must express our regret at some of the expres-

sions which the pamphlet contains.

I. In the treatment of the evidence from the New Testament on the subject of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of 'marriage' after divorce, the present controversy has shown a marked difference of method. It has been contended, on the one hand, that the teaching of our Lord recorded by St. Mark 1 and St. Luke 2 is to be read in the light of statements in St. Matthew's Gospel; 3 that the passages in the Epistle to the Romans 4 and the First Epistle to the Corinthians 5 are to be set aside as irrelevant; and that the comparison of the marriage bond to the union between Christ and the

1 St. Mark x. 11-12, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.'

<sup>2</sup> St. Luke xvi. 18, 'Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth a woman who has been put away from a husband (ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρός) committeth

3 St. Matt. v. 32, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry a woman who has been put away (ἀπολελυμένην) committeth adultery; 'xix. 9, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery' (or 'saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery'), 'and whoso marrieth a woman who has been put away (ἀπολελυμένην) committeth adultery.

4 Rom. vii. 1-4, 'Know ye not . . . that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to her husband while he liveth; but if her husband die, she is loosed from the law of the husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law through the body of Christ, that ye should be joined to another.'

I Cor. vii. 10-11, 'But unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.'

buil suc Tes the but asse only wife

189

Chu

who the l of c a pe 'ma evid

(

ing 1

the

St. I

exce recog taker party expo this Matt powe right tend 'savii

quest law e was n cation only 1 the C ceptic is a d tion (

both

marr marry law, v of the

VOL

Jan.

spect

er of

lain-

nade

Rev.

ce of

I. W.

y for

as a

pres-

esta-

ess of

hown

d, on

y St.

nents

pistle

ians 5

son of

d the

marry

all put iltery.'

arrieth

n who

nitteth

for the

r shall

nitteth

be for

ing for whoso

mitteth

over a

and is

usband

teress:

lteress,

ye also

should

t I, but if she

d: and

Church¹ is to be regarded as insufficient ground on which to build an argument for the indissolubility of marriage. On such a position as regards the interpretation of the New Testament, opinions have been based which agree in limiting the possibility of remarriage to cases of divorce after adultery, but in other respects differ from one another. It has been asserted by some that 'marriage' after such a divorce is lawful only for the innocent husband who has put away a guilty wife; by others that it is allowed to either husband or whife who is the innocent party; and by others, again, that either the husband or the wife, whether innocent or guilty, is capable of contracting a valid 'marriage,' so that even in a case of a person convicted of adultery any prohibition of a new 'marriage' is disciplinary only and should be removed upon

evidence of repentance being given.

On the other hand, it has been contended that the teaching recorded by St. Mark and St. Luke contains completely the law for Christians on this subject; that the words of St. Paul show he had no idea of the possibility of any such exception as St. Matthew's Gospel has been thought to recognize; and that, consequently, even when divorce has taken place because of adultery, no new 'marriage' of either party is possible in the lifetime of the other. Among the exponents of this view, again, there are differences of opinion. this time, as to the interpretation of the passages in St. Matthew's Gospel. Some regard these as conferring the power to put away an adulterous wife, but as not granting the right to a new 'marriage' after such a divorce. Others contend that the phrase translated in the Authorized Version 'saving for the cause of fornication' 2 is the true reading in both passages in St. Matthew, and means 'putting aside the question of fornication,' being not an exception to the general law enunciated by our Lord, but a mere statement that He was not at that time considering at all the question of fornication. Another interpretation is that these passages refer only to the Jews, and are not to be connected with the law of the Christian Church. According to a fourth view the exception does not allow the dissolution of a valid marriage, but is a declaration that where an unacknowledged act of fornication on the part of the woman has preceded the original 'marriage' among the Jews the man may put her away and marry another, because the first 'marriage' was, by Jewish law, void from the first, and it was only through the clemency of the man that the woman who had thus deceived him was

<sup>1</sup> Eph. v. 22-32.

<sup>2</sup> παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας.

VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

FF

any

"m

the

tex

app

tair

a W

mar

poir

to th

cede

dou

view rega

(p. 3

tent

at ti

but

Hin

and

which

do 1

asid

Dicti

'put

pend Deut

of and

passa

St. M

at lea munit

traore

may 1

case t

any a

if (1)

τορνεί

טיף עורד

ioined

1

not stoned to death.<sup>1</sup> A fifth method of treatment regards the former of the two passages as countenancing separation only, and by reading the latter as it is in the text of the Vatican MS., 'Whosever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and he who marrieth a woman who has been put away committeth adultery,' makes it easy to interpret it in the same sense.

After a careful survey of all which has been written on the subject with which we have been able to meet, we are strongly of opinion that the passages in St. Paul's Epistles cannot rightly be set aside in considering the question. It would be difficult to justify the argument in the Epistle to the Romans if the marriage bond is void or voidable because of any sin on the part of either of those bound by it. The prohibition of a new 'marriage' after separation in the First Epistle to the Corinthians is absolute; and, on any other view of the Gospel evidence than that which limits the application of the passages in St. Matthew to the Jews, and that which explains παρεκτός as meaning 'putting aside,' the fact that St. Paul states his teaching to be a repetition of what our Lord in His ministry had taught<sup>3</sup> shows that He does not exclude from this prohibition those who have been separated because of adultery.4 The comparison of Christian marriage with the union between Christ and His Church, introduced, as it is, in a practical exhortation on the duties of husbands and wives, is at least most easily explained if Christian marriage is indissoluble. And here we must express our surprise that the Bishop of Lincoln has thought it possible to treat of the 'argument from Scripture' (p. 35) without referring to the teaching of St. Paul.

We do not think it altogether easy to adopt any of the interpretations of the passages in St. Matthew's Gospel which have been suggested either by the advocates or by the opponents of the indissolubility of marriage. But it must be remembered that the former passage prohibits the 'marriage' of

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxii. 13-21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> I.e. the words 'and shall marry another' (καὶ γαμήση ἄλλην) do not occur. They are omitted in the marginal reading given both by the Revisers and by Westcott and Hort. See also Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries, p. 225, where Bishop Lightfoot appears to think 'the common text' doubtful.

foot appears to think 'the common text' doubtful.

This is shown by the words, 'Not I, but the Lord' (οὐκ ἐγὼ, ἀλλ' ὁ

Κύριος). See Lightfoot, ibid. 4 It is surely unreasonable to suppose that the parenthetical clause implies that there was intended to be a difference between the husband and the wife.

ds the only, atican cause e who

Jan.

itteth e. ritten et, we Paul's quesn the id or those after olute: n that atthew eaning ing to aught 3

those com-Christ al ext least soluble. hop of gument ning of

of the l which e oppobe reiage 'of

) do not h by the Epistles p Light-

ώ, ἀλλ' ὁ

al clause husband any divorced woman,1 and says nothing at all about the 'marriage' of any divorced man,2 while in the second passage the manuscripts exhibit such remarkable variations, and the text is in a state of such great uncertainty, that it does not appear to be justifiable to build any theory at all upon it.3

We feel bound here to refer to a statement which is contained in the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge. It is there stated:

'Many of the writers on this subject appear to me to start from a wrong point of view. Wishing to maintain the indissolubility of marriage, they begin by saying that God has Himself determined the point by declaring they are "no longer two but one flesh;" and more to the same effect. But this only declares what God's original antecedent Will is with regard to marriage; of which there can be no doubt. But the question for us to consider is not what is the ideal view of Holy Matrimony, but what is the duty of the Church with regard to the practice of Divorce which she finds in existence' (p. 34).

Now, there might be something to be said for such a contention, if the words 'they shall be one flesh' occurred only, at the original institution of marriage in the Book of Genesis; but when they are expressly adopted by our Blessed Lord Himself, in answer to a practical question of present import,4 and are made the reason upon which He lays down a law which is peremptorily declared,5 to say they have nothing to do with the subject appears to us to be no less than to put aside, however unintentionally, the authority of Christ.

1 άπολελυμένην. See, e.g., Winer, Grammar of the New Testament Diction, pt. iii. sect. 19.

<sup>2</sup> This is questioned by some on the ground that ἀπολύω must mean 'put away, so as to have the right of remarriage.' This view really depends on the theory, which there are grave reasons for questioning, that Deut. xxiv. 1-4 sanctions remarriage; and it is inconsistent with the use

of ἀπολύω by, e.g., Hermas, Pastor, II. iv. I.

3 It is well said in Watkins's Holy Matrimony, p. 177, 'There is no passage which certainly sanctions remarriage after divorce. The text of St. Matthew xix. 9, as it is found in some manuscripts, appears to do so, at least if the words are held to have reference to the Christian community, and if πορνεία be taken to include adultery. But there are extraordinary variations in the readings of this text; the original reading may well have contained no reference to remarriage at all; and in any case the uncertainty of the reading makes it very undesirable to base any argument upon it.' Moreover, it is necessary to remember that even if (1) the received text is right, (2) the passage refers to the Christian community, (3) πορνεία means adultery, it is doubtful whether εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία is to be taken with καὶ γαμήση ἄλλην as well as with δε αν ἀπολύση την γυναίκα αὐτοῦ.

 St. Matt. xix. 3; St. Mark x. 2.
 St. Matt. xix. 6; St. Mark x. 9, 'What therefore' ( δ οὖν) 'God hath ioined together, let not man put asunder.' FF2

the

me

ho

St.

wh

asi

sio

wri

Th

bee

ger

Au

and

has

bor

'm

Eas

of t

afte

An

An

ten

by

Ale

abs

pla

is (

mai

in p

of r

bilit

Ale

allo

asse

tulli

by a

that

rem

his o

Nor are we reassured by the Bishop's treatment of Deuteronomy xxiv. I-4. He appears to think that any recognition of 'marriage' after divorce which may be involved in that passage is of weight in considering the Christian law, whereas, whatever the exact meaning of the Mosaic permission may have been, our Lord distinctly set it aside, as having been granted because of the hardness of men's hearts, and as being abolished in His own declaration. If remarriage after divorce was not absolutely prohibited by Moses, that is no more an argument with regard to the Christian law of marriage than the Mosaic sanction of polygamy allows a Christian man to have at the same time two wives.

In both these points it is necessary to consider the Sacramental character of Christian marriage. That character depends on the applicability of the description 'one flesh' as an essential property of Christian marriages, and it creates a type of impossibility of the bond being made void, to which there is nothing altogether parallel in any marriage, however binding from other points of view, of unbaptized persons.

The general outcome of the consideration of the teaching of Holy Scripture appears to us to be as follows. Marriage, as originally ordained by God, was indissoluble. Under whatever conditions, separation for causes less than adultery was allowed by Moses, death being the penalty for adultery. The binding character of the original law of the indissolubility of marriage was declared by Christ both in His assertion of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If the interpretation of Deut. xxiv. 1-4 advocated by Dean Luckock (pp. 24-38) is adopted, this passage did not sanction remarriage. It may be noticed that since the publication of his first edition his view has received the support of Dr. Driver. See his *Critical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, pp. 269-72.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> St. Matt. v. 31-2, xix. 8-9; St. Mark x. 5-9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ex. xxi. 10; Deut. xxi. 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> It is difficult to see how marriage is Sacramental unless those contracting it are made to be 'one flesh:' it would not follow that in all cases where the 'one flesh' could be asserted the marriage would necessarily be Sacramental. This is important in view of the relation of primitive marriage to Christian marriage.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Gen. ii. 24.

Och in 24.

Deut. xxiv. I-4. It is not easy to ascertain the limits of the 'some unseemly thing' of verse I. Dr. Driver, in his Critical Commentary on Deuteronomy, p. 271, says that it 'denotes something short of actual unchastity may be inferred from the fact that for this a different penalty is enacted, viz. death (xxii. 22); in xxiii. 15 (14), also, the same expression is used, not of what is immoral, but only of what is unbecoming. It is most natural to understand it of immodest or indecent behaviour.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22. Compare St. John viii. 5.

Jan.

Deu-

cogni-

red in

law.

ermis-

de, as

men's

ation.2

ibited

rd to

ion of

same

Sacra-

racter

sh' as

eates a

oid, to

rriage,

ptized

aching

rriage,

Under

dultery

altery.7

ubility

tion of

Luckock

It may

riew has

ose conall cases

cessarily

ne 'some

entary on

of actual

penalty

It is

the general principles of marriage 1 and in His express enactment as recorded by St. Mark 2 and St. Luke, 3 and referred to by St. Paul. 4 It is most perilous so to press an interpretation, however possible among others in itself, of one passage 5 in St. Matthew where the text is clear, and of another passage 6 where the text is doubtful, as to make it necessary to put aside what both general considerations and particular expressions indicate as the teaching of Christ.

II. We have next to consider the various decisions and writings which are indicative of the teaching of the Church. There are here three points which may be regarded as having been placed beyond dispute. The first point is that the general law of the Western Church since the time of St. Augustine, whatever exceptions there may have been here and there in local councils and individual Penitential Books, has steadily maintained the indissolubility of the marriage bond. The second is that from the time of Justinian 'marriage' after divorce has been frequently allowed in the East. The third is that the earliest unquestionable assertion of the lawfulness of 'marriage,' even for the innocent husband, after a divorce for adultery, is in the writer known as Ambrosiaster, late in the fourth century.

The meaning of the teaching of some writers earlier than Ambrosiaster has been fiercely disputed. It has been contended, on the one side, that the prohibition of remarriage by Hermas, St. Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen must be held to be absolute and to include cases where separation has taken place because of adultery, and that the testimony of Lactantius is of little importance and not certainly in favour of remarriage. On the other side it has been urged that Hermas in prohibiting remarriage only does so to leave open a door of reconciliation, and not because of any absolute indissolubility; that Justin Martyr and Athenagoras and Clement of Alexandria are merely stating the general rule, and might allow an exception which they do not mention; that the assertion of indissolubility in the Montanist treatises of Tertullian is discredited alike by his Montanism at the time and by a passage of a contrary tendency in his earlier writings; that Origen himself, in the very treatise in which he asserts remarriage to be adultery, shows that he does not include in his denunciation cases where adultery has been the cause of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> St. Matt. xix. 4-6; St. Mark x. 5-9. <sup>3</sup> St. Mark x. 11-12.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> St. Luke xvi. 18. <sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 10–11. <sup>5</sup> St. Matt. v. 32. <sup>6</sup> St. Matt. xix. 9.

separation; and that Lactantius allows remarriage, and is not lightly to be set aside. For any detailed discussion of this subject we must be content to refer our readers to what we said in a former article.1 It is here sufficient for us to mention that the outcome of the very careful investigation to which these various authorities have been subjected by many writers is to emphasize the fact that there is among them no express permission of remarriage after divorce for adultery, while there are prohibitions of remarriage in general terms which appear to include all cases, a specific statement by Hermas that if the husband of an adulterous wife whom he has put away 'marries' he commits adultery, and a general tone which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than against the lawfulness of 'marriage' after divorce of any kind.

The writings of the later Fathers, about some points in whose teaching there has been controversy, lead us, though still more decidedly, in the same direction. That St. Augustine should admit that the subject is full of difficulties does not really diminish the weight which is rightly accorded to his definite declarations of the unlawfulness of remarriage in every case, That St. Basil should be wishful to deal gently with offenders in no way alters the value of his statement of the law. St. Epiphanius should appeal for toleration on the ground of mercy is no real evidence that what he thinks might be tolerated was lawful. That St. Asterius should imply that the husband of an adulterous wife may remarry indicates no more than an individual opinion. As to St. Chrysostom, we agree with Dean Luckock and Mr. Gray that

'the weight of his name has been quite unjustifiably thrown into the scale on the side of those who would allow remarriage after divorce on the ground that the original tie had been dissolved by adultery; '2 'whilst St. Chrysostom acknowledges again and again the right of

separation because of adultery, nowhere does he sanction any remarriage of the divorced person, so long as the true partner is alive.'3

1 Church Quarterly Review, April 1895, pp. 23-31.

2 History of Marriage, p. 152.

W for pu El 'm

189

tha adı WO 4 m obt

the

val

sin wit du car W Ch hav the ma Ca Ch

> and 70 0 amo mei wid

alle

sio

as onl

The not g00 that case As:

'mo be a έπρο BEON

<sup>3</sup> The Examiner Examined, p. 14. For the passages in the Fathers mentioned we must again refer to our article in April 1895, pp. 31-3. With regard to the passage in St. Epiphanius, in addition to the difficulties about the text mentioned by Dean Luckock (pp. 149-51), it is very important to notice that he does not express anything approaching approval of such 'marriages' as he has in view. What he says is that the word of God does not bring an accusation' (οὐκ αἰτιᾶται ὁ θεῖος λόγος) against one who has contracted a union of this kind, and 'does not proclaim him an outcast from the Church and from life' (οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἀποκηρύττει), but 'bears' with him 'because of his infirmity' (διαβαστάζει δια

Jan.

is not

f this

at we

ntion

which

riters

press

while

which

ermas

s put

tone

st the

whose

more

hould

really

efinite

case.

enders

That

and of

tole-

at the

es no

m, we

nto the

divorce tery;'2 ight of

any re-

tner is

Fathers

ficulties

ery im-

The Conciliar evidence before the year 400 is scanty. What there is supports the indissolubility of marriage. The forty-seventh Apostolical canon forbids a husband who has put away his wife to take another woman. The Council of Elvira forbids a wife who has left an adulterous husband to 'marry' another man. The Council of Arles, in determining that young Christians who have discovered their wives in adultery should be most strongly advised not to take other women, incidentally mentioned that they were forbidden to 'marry.'

In summing up the results that appear to us to have been obtained from the investigation into the law and custom of the Universal Church, it is necessary to observe the high value which is rightly attached to the clear Western tradition since the beginning of the fifth century, taken in connexion with the facts we have mentioned about the whole Church during the first four centuries. That the practice of the East cannot properly be regarded as discrediting the view that the Western tradition handed down the law of the primitive Church is, in our judgment, made clear by three facts which have not been sufficiently emphasized. In the first place, the East is less distinctly in favour of the lawfulness of remarriage than is frequently thought, since the Apostolical Canon forbidding it is still part of the law of the Orthodox Church, and the note attached to the canon regards the allowing of it as a custom which is in reality a transgression of the law.2 Secondly, the possibility of citing the East as a witness to the lawfulness of remarriage in the case only of divorce for adultery is removed by both the Greek and the Russian Churches in practice sanctioning remarriage

τὸ ἀσθενές), and that 'the holy word and the holy church of God have pity upon him' (ἐλεεῖ τοῦτον ὁ ἄγιος λόγος καὶ ἡ ἀγία θεοῦ ἐκκλησία). All this only amounts to acquiescence, and St. Epiphanius mentions as parallels to the mercy he thinks ought to be shown not only St. Paul's permission to widows to marry, but also the forgiveness of the incestuous Corinthian. The underlying thought in the whole passage apparently is that sin must not be too harshly dealt with. The proper bearing is not seen unless a good deal of the context is carefully studied. It should be noticed too that such allowance as he gives to remarriage is not limited to those cases in which the divorce has taken place because of adultery.

We quoted and discussed these decisions in April 1895, pp. 21-3. As regards Arles, there is no reason to suppose that, when persons were 'most strongly advised,' if they should disregard the advice, they would be admitted to Communion.

 $^2$  ταύτην τὴν συνήθειαν ήτις ἀπὸ τὸν 'Ρωμαϊκὸν καὶ πολιτικὸν νόμον ἐπροχώρησεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν δὲν ἀποδέχεται [i.e. does not allow] ὁ θεολόγος Γρηγόριος.

pproval ne word inst one him an τῆς ζωῆς τάζει διὰ

No.

the

the

to

wit

(p.

me

on

Bc

im

ea

tha

alr

ma

kn

of

alt

Gr

arg

is if

the

lar

kir

str

Pr

ing

Ch

in

evi

ou ap

pre

wh

it i

rec

66 ]

life

of div

after divorce on other grounds. In the third place, any claim that might otherwise be made for the Eastern custom as the inheritor of the law of the primitive Church becomes untenable when the existence of the custom has been traced to the influence of civil legislation. It may thus be seen that, so far as Church authority is concerned, there is a balance of evidence which might well be called overwhelming in favour of regarding the indissolubility of marriage as the true doctrine of the Church. It is a significant fact that the partial rewriting of the Dean of Lichfield's History of Marriage, in consideration of criticisms from various quarters, has resulted in the production of a stronger case than that which was presented in his first edition. Here, again, it would be most perilous to put aside so weighty a tradition because of exceptional teaching of individuals or exceptional decisions of local Councils, or because of the custom in the East on which we have commented. The true inference to be drawn from all which has sometimes been cited in opposition to the doctrine of indissolubility is that it was in the face of many practical difficulties, and of strong temptations to relax what was believed to be the rule of Christ, that the Western branch of the Church continued steadily to maintain the indissoluble character of the marriage tie.

III. We have now to turn from the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Universal Church to the existing law of the Church in England. In our former article we strongly expressed our opinion that

'the existing law of the Church of England . . . as stated in the Prayer Book in the natural sense of the words of the Marriage Service, as indicated in the canons of 1603, and as illustrated by the traditional teaching of representative divines, is that the bond of Christian marriage is indissoluble, and that if married persons are separated, even for adultery, neither party may contract a fresh "marriage" in the lifetime of the other (p. 6).

A contrary position is taken up by the Bishop of Lincoln. In his *Charge* he says:

'More than one writer has lately appealed with confidence to the high and beautiful language of our Marriage Service as deciding the question as to the teaching of the Church of England on this point.

<sup>1</sup> There are lists of the many grounds on which it is possible for a divorce, which gives the right to remarriage, to be granted, in Covel, Some Account of the present Greek Church, pp. 218-27; Watkins, Holy Matrimony, pp. 352-62. The reasons for which divorce and remarriage have been allowed in Russia in recent years include disappearance or banishment of one of the married persons.

XUM

Jan.

any

ustom

comes

traced

that.

nce of

favour

doc-

ge, in sulted

most excep-

f local

ch we

om all

ctrine

actical

t was

Now it may be conceded at once that they are right in referring to the Marriage Service as one of the chief causes, or as the chief cause, of the wide-spread belief in the indissolubility of marriage, and yet the argument is really of no value as a proof that the Church intended to teach the absolute indissolubility in all cases, as a comparison with the Marriage Service in the Greek Church will at once show' (p. 36).

There are two comments which occur to us on this statement. The first is that the argument based by the Bishop on the parallel between the language of the English Prayer Book and that of the Greek Marriage Service ignores an important consideration. The Greek Service represents the earlier custom and true law of the Eastern Church rather than the present practice. It is parallel to the fact we have already mentioned of the retention of the prohibition of remarriage in the Greek canons. Other instances have been known of a true doctrine remaining enshrined in the language of a Service concurrently with the existence of practices altogether inconsistent with it. The comparison, then, of the Greek and English Services affords no support to the Bishop's argument.

Our second comment is that, so far as the English Church is concerned, there might be something in the Bishop's plea if the Prayer Book stood alone. As we formerly pointed out, there are difficulties in estimating the exact force of the language used in Services unless there is evidence of some kind from another source. The fact upon which we laid stress was that the obvious meaning of the words of the Prayer Book could be shown to be the true meaning by paying attention to the canons of 1603 and the history of the Church in England. It was to a threefold line of argument, in which the natural interpretation of each section of the evidence supported that of each other section, that, so far as our own branch of the Church is concerned, we made our appeal. If the Bishop of Lincoln ignores the canons in interpreting the Prayer Book, it is perhaps because of the view which he takes of the bearing of the canons. On this point it is stated in the *Charge*:

'It is of course beyond question that the 107th Canon of 1603 requires that the parties so separated as is there contemplated shall "live chastely and continently; neither shall they, during each other's life, contract matrimony with any other person." These words have been sometimes quoted as if they settled the question for the Church of England, that in no case could remarriage be allowed after divorce.

Holy law of rongly

in the arriage by the ond of ons are a fresh

to the

incoln.

le for a Covel, as, Holy narriage rance or

or

13/1

ad

be

ar

pe

pr

TI

for

Li

m

H

the

vie

bu

ab

ce

he

the

112

ma

to

we

Th

for

246

'But the letter of the three Canons of 1603 (105, 106, 107) does not necessarily cover more than the cases of nullity of marriage and

of separation a thoro et mensa.

'I would not venture to say how far these Canons could be construed so as to include divortium a vinculo. I submit that, taken in their literal and simplest meaning, they only express the mind of our Church with regard to nullity, where due circumspection and advice are required, and separation a thoro et mensa, in which security is to be taken for the parties not marrying during each other's lifetime. But at the time when these Canons were passed there were other forms of procedure besides those of the Spiritual Courts which they were designed to regulate' (p. 38).

There is an obvious reason why the canons treat only of decrees of nullity and separations a thoro et mensa. It is that the possibility of divorce a vinculo was not contemplated. If in enacting the canons the Church in England had meant to introduce a new type of divorce unknown in the traditional system of Church law which it inherited, is it conceivable that the regulations laid down should wholly ignore the new law it was intended to introduce? The Bishop says that 'at the time when these Canons were passed there were other forms of procedure besides those of the Spiritual Courts.' canons can hardly have had in view the passing of private Acts of Parliament which should grant divorces a vinculo and allow remarriage to persons who had obtained separations a thoro et mensa from the ecclesiastical court by means of pledging themselves not to remarry; and, apart from such a recognition in the canons, the existence of 'other forms of procedure' has no bearing on the case before us. It is the law of the Church in England, not the practice of any nonecclesiastical authority, which we have under consideration. With all respect for a prelate who has deservedly won the deep affection of very many English Churchmen, we are bound, in the interests of truth, to say that we consider his argument on the subject of the canons of 1603 to be without value.

The Bishop says nothing on the support which the teaching of great English divines gives to the belief that the obvious meaning of the Prayer Book and the canons is the true meaning; and on this point we need only say that if we cannot commend the tone of *The Examiner Examined* we have no doubt that Mr. Gray is abundantly justified in his claim that the assertions of the York Report with regard to the traditional teaching of English theologians were, in all essentials

tial matters, rightly made.

We have read and carefully considered all that we have seen

aken in

of our

vice are

is to be

e. But

orms of ere de-

only of

is that

ed. If

eant to

litional

le that

ew law

at the

private

ulo and

tions a

such a

rms of

y non-

eration.

ne deep

The

on the doctrine of Marriage in the English Church since we wrote before, and it is with even deepened conviction that we adhere to the position which we then maintained.

And on the Canon Law in general the Bishon does not

And on the Canon Law in general the Bishop does not seem to realize the difference between regulations which may be traced to some local or personal influence and those which

are the clear-cut expressions of great traditions.

To sum up again the practical issue, it would be most perilous to alter the law which we have inherited, and which is a trust committed to our charge, except on the clearest proofs that the Church in England has in this matter acted in opposition to Holy Scripture and the Universal Church. Those proofs, as we have already indicated, are certainly not forthcoming.

IV. But here we are met by a new consideration. In spite of the 'reference' and 'appeal' which the Bishop of Lincoln makes 'to Holy Scripture and the Universal Church' (p. 42), it is evident that he is of opinion that much attention must be paid to the circumstances of the time. Thus, he

says

'The question for us to consider is not what is the ideal view of Holy Matrimony, but what is the duty of the Church with regard to the practice of Divorce which she finds in existence. The point of view then from which we should consider this question is not ideal, but practical, ethical, remedial. We are not saying what ought to be the normal condition of married life, but what may be done under the head of equity and mercy to save man from the worst results of his own folly' (p. 34).

As we understand the Bishop's position, it is that, in the absence of a rigid law of indissolubility admitting of no exceptions, it is right to take into consideration questions of expediency. There is no doubt, as we have allowed, that here and there a Christian writer or a local council has thought it right to teach and act on grounds of expediency in this matter. The results have not been encouraging. The 'laws of Howell the Good,' probably with the best intentions, made marriage terminable by mutual consent, with freedom to 'marry' again, provided certain pecuniary arrangements were satisfactorily made. The 'Penitential of Archbishop Theodore,' which is one of the Bishop of Lincoln's authorities for introducing 'moral considerations' (p. 43), allowed the

gument lue. e teachthe obthe true we canye have s claim to the l essen-

ve seen

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Haddan and Stubbs, Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, i. 246-51. These laws, agreed upon by an assembly of clergy and laity representing all Wales about the year 928 A.D., were evidently intended to promote morality; see Haddan and Stubbs, ibid. pp. 209-11.

ou

sa

cia

is

in

in

tic

is

re

N

th

ea

Wa

for

to

sil

CO

to

th

to

th

pe

in

po

in

of

th

wife of a husband imprisoned for crime to 'marry' another man after the lapse of a year, and the husband of a captive wife similarly to take another woman, and a husband deserted by his wife to 'marry' again at the end of five years.\(^1\) And even if such methods of action had led to results of a more satisfactory type, the judgment of the Church has been

that there is a law of Christ to administer.

We are unable, then, to assent to the principles of the Bishop's appeal, limited to a certain extent though it is, by other considerations, to expediency. But if we were disposed to do so, we do not think that arguments from expediency would lead us in the same direction as they appear to have led him. Long before the Act of 1857 was introduced there were not wanting thoughtful writers who saw practical evils in the very limited number of divorces which were possible when an Act of Parliament was needed for each, and if the only cause to be recognized was the adultery of the wife. Since that Act has been in full operation testimony has come from those who have had knowledge of its working to show its evil results. The strongest language might be used with-

1 Panit. Theod. II. xii. 8, 19, 20-4; see Haddan and Stubbs, ibid. iii.

199-201.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Archdeacon Paley, though he was of opinion that our Lord's teaching sanctioned the remarriage of both parties after divorce in the case of the wife's adultery, thought it necessary to make use of severe pecuniary penalties in addition to elaborate safeguards; and, though he does not seem to be consistent throughout his discussion of the subject, and says that 'the law of nature admits of an exception in favour of the nijured party' in a large number of cases, wrote, 'A lawyer, whose counsels are directed by views of general utility, and obstructed by no local impediment, would make the marriage contract indissoluble during the joint lives of the parties. . . Upon the whole, the power of divorce is evidently and greatly to the disadvantage of the woman; and the only question appears to be, whether the real and permanent happiness of one half of the species should be surrendered to the caprice and voluptuousness of the other.' See his Moral and Political Philosophy, bk. iii. pt. iii. chap, vii.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Sir J. T. Coleridge, Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, p. 433: 
<sup>6</sup> I do not believe that the eminent judges to whom I have referred, could we have the benefit now of their advice, would be disposed to commend the law which they have been called on to administer. It may be noticed that the well-known statement of Lord Stowell, 'The general happiness of the married life is secured by its indissolubility,' was endorsed by Lord Penzance after his experience as judge of the Divorce Court: see Times, April 30, 1891, p. 8. It is not certain that either Lord Stowell or Lord Penzance attached quite the same meaning to the word 'indissolubility' as is attached to it by theologians, and the particular point they were discussing was not that now under consideration, but their general line of argument is against regarding marriage as dissoluble

under any circumstances.

nother

aptive

years.1

been

of the

is, by

posed

liency

have

there

l evils

ssible

if the

wife.2

come

with-

bid. iii.

Lord's

in the

ugh he

ubject,

of the

e coun-

o local

orce is

he only

of one

pt. iii.

p. 433:

, could

nay be

general

vas en-

Divorce er Lord

rticular

on, but soluble out exaggeration of the iniquities which, in spite of attempted safeguards and the control of able judges, have become associated with the Court which the Act created. If experience is to be our teacher and expediency our aim, we are led again in the direction of affirming the necessity of maintaining the indical hability of the marriege tip.

indissolubility of the marriage tie.

In connexion with this point there is a further consideration which, as soon as the question of expediency is mooted, is of importance. Most of those Churchmen who wish to regard marriage as in some cases dissoluble limit the right of remarriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery. Now, this, as things are now, is a wholly different matter from that which would be before the mind of any writer of the early Church who may have been inclined to concede what was so extensively denied. In the early Church Christians formed a body the different members of which were in outward as well as in unseen ways in very special relations to one another, and who were under discipline. It was possible for the rulers of the Church to know how far, for instance, the husband of an adulteress was really deserving of consideration. They would be blind indeed who would dare to say that all, or any large proportion of, the husbands who in the English Divorce Court are set free from adulterous wives are morally entitled to be described as 'innocent.'

And if there should be a certain number of cases in which the impossibility of remarriage would cause real hardship to persons deserving of consideration, we can only point out that the teaching of Christ does not lead Christians to expect the absence of hardship in their lives, and that the necessary maintenance of general laws must sometimes

inevitably involve individual suffering.1

V. There are indications, of which the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge is not the least, that our English Bishops are disposed to allow under certain conditions the 'marriage' in church of divorced persons and the admission to the Holy Communion of those who after divorce have been 'married' in church or before a registrar. We trust that the Providence of God may avert any formal action giving effect to such a tendency. In our judgment it would result in evils of which it is not easy to see the end.

1 See Butler, Analogy, pt. i. chap. vii.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The danger of a recognition throughout the greater part of the Anglican Communion of the dissolubility of marriage under some circumstances is not to be ignored. In the Church of the United States the claim of the 'innocent party' to remarriage is allowed. The bishops

by mu

not

por

has

des

of i

wh

is

the

rea

cor

tain

kno

and

up,

whi

by :

cip

fab

vin

mai

cho

froi

rest

con

tion

inc

kee

sma

ger

it 1

pro

self

con

app

resi

tha

We do not think some who are high in office in the Church have fully estimated the distress that is being caused to many Churchmen. We do not altogether sympathize with those who are being led by such episcopal utterances as the Charge we have had under review to question the tenability of their position in the Church of England. The decision of the value of the claims of the See of Rome must be made upon different grounds from this particular question. The separate utterances of the Bishops are not, as Dr. Pusey had occasion more than once to point out, the voice of the Church of England. Even if the English Church should be involved in some decision on the subject of marriage that is inconsistent with the teaching of Christ, it might still be possible to point to the strange attitude of Eastern Christians as indicating that anomalies in such a matter do not of necessity imply that a religious body has ceased to be a part of the true Church. But we cannot refrain, even at the risk of seeming presumptuous, from expressing our opinion that our rulers would do well to give not a little thought to the unsettlement of many minds. It is possible for us to know, what perhaps the very dignity of their position makes it difficult for them to adequately realize, that some recent utterances have made sad the hearts of loyal sons of the Church of England, and have played into the hands of those who are wishful to discredit her claims.

It is, however, for far deeper reasons that we venture most earnestly to advocate the retention of what we believe to be the present law of the Church in England forbidding the remarriage of any divorced persons. Careful study of the evidence within our reach and a full consideration of the recent controversies in England make us to be unhesitatingly convinced that the law of Christ laid down in Holy Scripture, committed to Christians, and defined and administered by the Church, affirms the absolute indissolubility of Christian marriage. Nor are we less convinced that any recognition

of New South Wales have lately issued instructions to their clergy for the purpose of guarding the sacredness of Christian marriage, in which they say 'the Church of England recognizes divorce for one cause only, viz. infidelity to the marriage vow,' and, while forbidding remarriage to the 'guilty party,' leave a discretion to the bishop of the diocese in the case of the 'innocent party' (see Guardian, November 13, 1895, p. 1752). In Canada a well-informed writer anticipates that 'the right to marry again after a divorce for adultery will be granted to the innocent party by the General Synod' next year (see Guardian, October 9, 1895, p. 1487). The significance of these facts is that these concessions are made by those who are desirous of protecting the interests of Christian morality.

XUM

by Churchmen of the possibility of 'marriage' after divorce must have an injurious effect upon Christian morality.

Marriage is at the very centre of human life. It cannot be touched without affecting what is of highest importance to the individual and the race. Christian theology has taught us to see in it the creation of an objective bond, the setting up of a relation which no subsequent events can destroy. To overturn this belief is to imperil the safeguards of family life, the protection of woman's honour, the restraints which the best of mortals sometimes need. Without it, it is hard to see what may become of distinctions which make the difference between acts that are lawful and gross sins real.

In conclusion we would recall words of great power which appeared nearly forty years ago in the pages of our esteemed contemporary the *Quarterly Review*:

'Man, restless under suffering, is apathetic enough as to ascertaining the source of the blessings he enjoys, or paying the debt of gratitude he owes in their behalf. And now we do not seem to know by what great Providence of God-by what vigilance, labour, and courage of men-the institution of marriage has been wrought up, in this fallen and disordered world, to the state of strictness in which we see it, and which renders it the most potent instrument by far, among all laws and institutions, both in mitigating the principle of personal selfishness, and in sustaining and consolidating the fabric of society. When we allow ourselves to speak lightly about vindicating rights and liberties, we forget that beyond all things else marriage derives its essential and specific character from restraint: restraint from the choice of more than a single wife; restraint from choosing her among near relatives by blood or affinity; restraint from the carnal use of woman in any relation inferior to marriage; restraint from forming any temporary or any other than a lifelong By the prohibition of polygamy it concentrates the affection, which its first tendency is to diffuse; by the prohibition of incest it secures the union of families as well as individuals, and keeps the scenes of dawning life and early intimacy free from the smallest taint of appetite; by the prohibition of concubinage it guards the dignity of woman and chastens whatever might be dangerous as a temptation in marriage through the weight of domestic cares and responsibilities; by the prohibition of divorce, above all, it makes the conjugal union not a mere indulgence of taste and provision for enjoyment, but a powerful instrument of discipline and self-subjugation, worthy to take rank in that subtle and wonderful system of appointed means by which the life of man on earth becomes his school for heaven. But whence came all this elaborate apparatus? It has been Christianity alone which has been able to restore to us the primitive treasure of mankind, and even to enlarge that treasure . . . .

XUM

Jan.
n the aused athize ances

n the The must quesot, as t, the

t, the hurch marnight astern er do

to be en at our little ssible

posithat loyal the nture

dding dy of f the ingly Scriptered Christion gy for

which e only, arriage ese in , 1895, e right nocent , 1895, ns are ristian

'A time may come when society cannot bear the strictness of the Christian law, and will reject the drill that is necessary to make the soldier. It will then doubtless largely fall back upon that lower conception of marriage, which treats it as a purely civil contract between individuals . . . . If we are not strong enough to hold the lower portion of society up to Christianity, let us not be mad enough to drag the very rites of Christianity down to the lowered and lowering level of society. Let the salt of the earth still keep its savour. and the darkness of the body be illumined, as far as it may, by the eye that still wakes within it.'1

## ART. VIII.—BENJAMIN JOWETT.

1. College Sermons. By the late BENJAMIN JOWETT, Master of Balliol College. Edited by the Very Rev. the Hon. W. H. FREMANTLE, M.A., Dean of Ripon. (London,

2. Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol. A Personal Memoir. By the Hon. L. A. TOLLEMACHE. (London, 1895.)

'EVERY man is born an Aristotelian or a Platonist. I do not think it possible that any one born an Aristotelian can become a Platonist, and I am sure no born Platonist can ever change into an Aristotelian. They are two classes of men, beside which it is next to impossible to conceive a third.' It may be questioned whether an exception to the truth of this celebrated dictum of S. T. Coleridge 2 was not presented by the author of these Sermons. That Jowett was strongly drawn towards Platonism hardly requires proof. It is seen in the tentative, experimental manner in which he was fond of putting forward his views, particularly in his earlier writings, in his tempered scepticism, in his love of the Socratic method and Socratic irony, and in the many-sidedness of his intellect and character. That his mind was steeped in Plato none will deny who can remember listening many years ago to him when examining candidates for honours in viva voce, who attended his lectures, or have any acquaintance with the monumental translation of his favourite Greek author, by which, as Sir John Lubbock said, he has made Plato an English classic.

On the other hand, it is no less certain that Aristotle had stamped his influence upon Jowett. The cast of his mind was

<sup>2</sup> Table Talk, p. 100, ed. 1858.

1896 emir Sern

a co be n the r not l the and than

be tr whic of th them N

Mem a vir be in Arist teach the c to ob

·

that th

Episco exclus Father their 1 their o who d notion exercis assum trifle o forgett to love rather sugges

detract Si he en genera and he

out its

spirit

ages w

VOL

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Quarterly Review, July 1857, pp. 285-6, 288.

f the the ower tract the ough wervour.

y the

Jan.

1896

aster Hon. idon,

moir. o not can

t can ses of third. th of ented ongly s seen fond

earlier of the sidedeeped many ours in ntance

made le had nd was

Greek

eminently practical, as appears throughout, both in these Sermons and in Mr. Tollemache's Personal Memoir; and in a college tutor who was supposed at one time by outsiders to be nothing more than a dreamy student and recluse, this is the more remarkable. He showed impatience of discussions not bearing on practice. Boswell's Johnson he ranked among the most valuable of books, and for Johnson's conversation and character he had the greatest admiration. But rather than classify him as either Aristotelian or Platonist, it would be truer, perhaps, to point to the independence of thought which distinguishes Jowett. He knew and tested the systems of the different schools of philosophy, but lived apart from them himself. 'Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.'

Mr. Lionel Tollemache, indeed, in his interesting Personal Memoir of Jowett goes so far as to maintain that he 'made a virtue of inconsistency,' and that 'his mind seemed often to be in a state of flux' (pp. 79, 80). One cardinal doctrine of Aristotle, that of the golden mean, is very noticeable in his teaching, as evidenced by this volume of Sermons. Among the causes e.g. of the Church's failures, he places the failure

to observe the due mean.

'When men have persuaded themselves (perhaps on the ground that they alone have the true form of Church government, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian or Independent) that their Church is exclusively the Church of God, then, instead of learning, like their Father Who is in heaven, to embrace all other men in the arms of their love, their affections become narrowed and fixed on persons of their own sect. Those who agree with them they call good, those who disagree with them, evil; they concentrate their minds on some notion, some power, some practice, which they desire to maintain or exercise. They will even make God the author of their fancies, and assume a Divine authority for some minute point of doctrine, some trifle of ritual, some external form, some ancient metaphysical subtlety, forgetting that the sum of real religion must ever be "to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God." This is a page, or rather many pages, in the history of the Christian Church, and suggests one reason why Christianity has failed so much in carrying out its objects, because the spirit of party has taken the place of the spirit of Christ-the spirit of violence and persecution in former ages which has dwindled into the spirit of enmity and dislike and detraction in our own,' 1

Similarly, in Sermon VI., on the 'Grounds of Hopefulness,' he enforces the duty of taking a temperate estimate of life generally, and in politics of cultivating the spirit of confidence and hope.

1 Sermon VII. p. 109.

VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

GG

th

th

sa

th

(p.

ma

· A

of

car

but

afte

and

to 1

pai

(p.

No

pred

mur

These are the two opposite poles of political feeling, the one exaggerating, the other minimizing actions and events; the one all enthusiasm and alarm, the other cynical and hopeless; the one always darkening or illumining the prospect with the ever-varying colours of its own mind, the others a state to which all political truth is summed up in the axiom, "Let things alone." To these I would oppose the temper of mind which sees things as they really are, which is formed by facts, and never allows the imagination to get the better of them; which is ready to fight hand to hand against real evils, and does not waste its strength upon the creations of fancy' (p. 88).

This pervading tone of mind might be illustrated by many other passages. We may refer to one especially, too long to quote at length, in a sermon preached in Balliol Chapel ten years ago, containing an admirable picture of the successful student:

'They'—the true students, he says—'instinctively perceive what is important and what is unimportant; and, as no man can remember all things, they keep the two in their proper places. They have the sense of proportion, which the Greeks called by an expressive term, "the art of measuring," and which we commonly term "judgment"' (p. 188).

Happy indeed were the men whose good fortune it was to listen to such words of wisdom in their undergraduate days!

The eminently sober and at the same time cheerful view which Jowett took of life comes out in many places. Thus, in an excellent sermon preached before the University for the first time as head of his College (November 26, 1871) he weighs dispassionately the prospects of Christianity, and, after taking due account of the reasons for despondency, he gives the true grounds for expectation of improvement in the future:

The England of a hundred years hence may wear another and a smiling face—may perhaps show that an old country has the blessings of a new. There is no law of nature or of political economy which forbids this; the experience of other countries encourages us in the hope of it. And the Gospel will not allow us to entertain the fatal doctrine that nations, like individuals, tend necessarily to decay; or that of human evils there is not a great part which kings or statesmen may cause or cure. . . Whether this be too bold a speculation or not, we may be assured of this, that there never will be a millennium on earth until we make one' (pp. 74, 76).

He does not refrain from speaking out very plainly at times of the great dangers that beset the undergraduate's career, nor shrink from dealing with such homely matters as bala their tense othe with that of w speci

hone

there

and s made no do was o gover

by Jolent w sonab

1 T

Mr. To silence exactne Jan.

one

e all

rving

litical

really

on to

gainst

ons of

ed by

y, too

Balliol

of the

erceive

an can

places. I by an

mmonly

was to

days!

ul view

for the

871) he

nd, after

ne gives

in the

other and

has the

political

countries

llow us to

nd neces-

is be too

here never 76).

plainly at graduate's

natters as

Thus.

the husbandry and use of money, the avoidance of debt, and the misery entailed by it. 'We are not leading the lives of saints and angels, and we must not sink into negligence about the common duties of life, under the pretence that we are' (p. 170). While he praises the character of the thorough man of business, he is on his guard against over-praising it. 'And though I have been saying that a man should be careful of money, yet there is also a sense in which he should be careless of it, never allowing himself to regard it as an end, but only as a means to something better' (p. 174). And after stating fairly the objections to indiscriminate charity and its demoralizing effects, he adds: 'The inference seems to be, not that we ought to get rid of charity, but that greater pains and care should be taken in the administration of it' (p. 176), and dwells upon some of the nobler uses of money. Nor can we forget how the Master of Balliol exemplified these precepts by his own practice, in the many striking acts of munificence and self-sacrifice which often surprised even those who knew him best.

Again, these Sermons, while they exhibit the perfection of balance and harmony which were such marked features in their writer, also show another side of his character, his intense sympathy-sympathy with the suffering and trials of others, sympathy of the old with the young, of the teacher with the taught, with work outside the University—e.g. in that done by Oxford men at Toynbee Hall, to the founding of which Jowett was largely instrumental. Mr. Tollemache specially dwells on his 'gentle and sympathetic handling of honest doubt' (p. 127). He loves to dwell on the power that there is in sympathy and affection to draw men out of themselves, and points out how there has been a union of sternness and softness, of gentleness and violence, in those who have made the greatest impression on their fellow creatures. And no doubt this union of tenderness and sympathy with strength was one of the chief secrets of Jowett's signal success in the government of his college.

No one would expect to find points of doctrine discussed by Jowett, and some persons when they reflect on the excellent work of the Cambridge School of Theology may reasonably resent the slighting tone in which study of the text <sup>1</sup>

¹ The strangest instance that occurs of Jowett's disregard for textual accuracy occurs in Sermon XII. (Luke iv. 4), on Conversation, of which Mr. Tollemache remarks that it was written 'by this late convert from silence to sociability, with the zeal of a convert '(p. 22). For the sake of exactness we give the actual words: 'And now . . . let us confine ourselves

..1

tl

h

g

P

m

to

lif

th

of

an

m

aca

It

ing

and

Th

or

cor

'tre

ber

sop

not

tho

gra

or s

sona

had

ject kept

mee

with

both

quai

the

Stua

had teach

and s

great

ford

of Scripture and comparison of documents is spoken of— 'those microscopic enquiries respecting the composition of the Gospels, which have so greatly exercised critics for more than a century, and had better perhaps be dropped for ever, now that we seem to know all that can be known on the subject' (p. 327). But though this complete absence of dogma and disparagement of textual criticism is palpable, the lifeand teaching, and spirit of Christ is appealed to throughout e.g. very beautifully in Sermon XVIII.: 'He went about doing good;' and if in addressing those on the threshold of manhood prudential considerations may seem to be rather too prominently put forward, they are always reinforced and supplemented by strictly religious motives, and by the prospect which a future existence holds out with its boundless possibilities of improvement and development.

The points on which he dwells with greatest effect, and to which he constantly reverts, are not the hackneyed uncertainty but rather the comparative certainty of life—the use to be made of the years that on a sober calculation may be expected—the plan of life to be sketched out—the duty of making the most of it, in the highest sense of the words—the necessary limitations of our powers and the cultivation of them in the direction that is most likely to be profitable—the causes of failure and success, of wasted lives and of noble results. By deep and suggestive reflections on these and similar topics, often with great felicity of language and illustration he lifts his subject easily and naturally into a higher region, and ends on a note of the most exalted Christian thought.

The well-known influence that the late Master of Balliol brought to bear upon successive generations of undergraduates is better understood by a perusal of this volume. The third of the Sermons, 'An Introduction to Oxford,' must have been a new revelation and a powerful stimulus to the Fresh-

to the words of the text, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth," or, as the last clause is read in the best Greek manuscripts, "but by every word." Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word—there the verse stops' (p. 205). Will it be believed that the facts are diametrically opposite to this statement? The documentary evidence for Luke iv. 4 is as follows:

- (1) οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτφ μόνφ ζήσεται ὁ ανος Β κ L.
- (2) οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτφ μόνφ ζήσεται ὁ ανος † ἀλλ' ( οτ ἐν ) παντὶ ἡήματι θεοῦ,
  Α D and most uncials.
- (3) οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτφ μόνφ ζήσεται ὁ ανος † ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένφ διὰ στόματος θυ, most cursives.

There is no evidence for  $\partial \lambda \lambda' \in \mathcal{H}$  mart  $\partial \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha r \iota$  (without  $\partial \epsilon \circ \hat{\nu}$ ).

Jan.

of-

on of

more

ever,

ogma

e life

out-

doing man-

r too

and

pro-

ndless

and to

tainty

men, whom it specially addressed at a very critical period of their lives. A few of them, such as the one preached after his election, when the rebuilding of the college was in progress; the touching 'In Memoriam' on Lewis Nettleship, who perished in the attempt to ascend Mont Blanc by the Dôme du Gouter three years ago; as well as the deeply affecting message to the college sent by the Master in 1891, when he was lying between life and death, are of more direct interest to Balliol men. But the valuable lessons on the conduct of life and the formation of character interspersed throughout these pages will minister to the intellectual and spiritual needs of others beyond the sphere of those who first heard them; and we are glad to see that a volume of Jowett's Sermons on more general questions is reserved for a future occasion.

The present instalment is indeed far from being merely academical. It abounds in matter interesting to all readers. It illustrates the description once given of Jowett, as exhibiting a sort of glorified common-sense. Its style is original and simple, reflecting the strong personality of the preacher. There are no flights of eloquence. There is no mannerism or straining after effect; no mysticism or reserve. We welcome heartily this permanent record of his religious teaching, 'treasuring the look we cannot find'—the look of mingled benevolence and wisdom—and the words of practical philosophy, of calm counsel and kindly encouragement, 'that are

not heard again ' (In Memoriam, xviii.).

Mr. Tollemache's short volume is in no sense a biography. though in one place (p. 130) he speaks of himself as a biographer. But, short as it is, it is the most valuable analysis or study that has appeared of one of the most striking personalities of our time. It teems with interest. Its author had enjoyed the rare advantage of a friendship with the subject of his memoir, begun when he was an undergraduate and kept up in spite of long intervals, during which they did not meet, through his life. He is further equipped for grappling with the intellectual problems that arise throughout the volume, both by his own academical training and by personal acquaintance with several of the most remarkable thinkers of the middle of this century, among them Grote and John Stuart Mill. The latter told Tollemache (in 1864) that he had been converted from a strong dislike of the Oxford teaching to a more hopeful view of the methods employed, and seemed to imply that he attributed the improvement in great measure to Jowett. Another leader of thought in Oxford with whom Mr. Tollemache was on terms of intimate

to be
see exuty of
ords—
tion of
e—the
ble red simitration
region,
aght.

Balliol aduates he third st have Fresh-

c, but by clause is Ian shall stops' (p. te to this ows:

ιατι θεοῦ,

ορευομένφ

.189

ane

be

To

sup

cat

Æ

'Y

he

wh

by

out

que

kin

inc

had

Ma

wh

wh

em

of

sec

itse

St.

rea

fav

unc

sist

the

not

gro Me

else

and

cou

par

pose

the be c

(p. i

the

dete

friendship was the late Mark Pattison. A large, some may think a rather disproportionate, part of this volume is taken up with the points of comparison and contrast between the Rector of Lincoln and the Master of Balliol. Jowett held that the University should be, above all things, a place of tuition. On the other hand, Pattison wished to model Oxford after the fashion of a German university; to make it a sort of nursery or garden—'a pépinière of research.' Pattison set himself strongly against the growing worship of athletics. There are some scathing words on this topic in his Suggestions on Academical Organisation:

'As soon as the summer weather sets in, the colleges are disorganized; study, even the pretence of it, is at an end. Play is thenceforward the only thought. They are playing all day, or preparing for it, or refreshing themselves after their fatigues. There is a hot breakfast and lounge from 9 to 10 A.M. This is called training. At 12 the drag which is to carry them out to the cricket-ground begins its rounds, and the work of the day is over' (p. 316).

Jowett, on the contrary, looked with a kindly eye on young men at their recreations, and is said to have subscribed, as Master, 3,000l. to the purchase of 'Balliol Field.' Again, Pattison accepted Evolution, while Jowett was repelled by Darwinism. Jowett resented the charge of scepticism when brought against him in the Saturday Review. To Pattison such a charge would have caused no uneasiness.

'In this respect,' Mr. Tollemache says, 'it is probable that the standpoints of the two men were less far asunder in reality than in appearance. Pattison was consciously not very unlike what Jowett was half-consciously. Each of them dealt summarily with inconvenient ethical knots, while Jowett tried to persuade himself that he was untying them' (p. 65).

And he sums up the contrast between the two thus: 'Perhaps the difference may best be indicated by saying that Pattison practised *economy of truth*, whereas Jowett rather practised *economy of logic*' (p. 132).

Those who have not been under the wand of the magician can hardly understand the unique charm that Jowett possessed. His voice—the voice was the man—his benignant smile, and genial laugh, or 'cherub-chirp,' the fascination of his presence and conversation, and even of his shyness and his silence, were all sui generis. But with all this fascination there was a certain inconsistency and contradiction which is not concealed in Mr. Tollemache's portrait. He often used to probe him with 'stodgy' questions in their walks together,

e may sen up Rector at the uition. after ort of on set aletics.

Jan.

Play is or pre-There d trainground

young bed, as Again, led by when attison

that the than in Jowett inconelf that

'Perat Patr pracagician tt pos-

ignant tion of ss and ination hich is n used gether, and Jowett once stipulated that one such at a time should be considered enough. An amusing instance is given where Tollemache accused Socrates of giving countenance to vulgar superstition just before his death. 'Not only did he thus cause the death of the poor little cock, but he implied that Æsculapius took pleasure in its sacrifice.' Jowett's reply was, 'Yes, I suppose this might be called an eccentricity. Perhaps he would not have much liked to be cross-questioned as to why he did it' (p. 35). And shortly after, when pressed by Tollemache to explain his preference for a religion without miracles, he seemed himself not to like to be cross-questioned too closely.

Mr. Tollemache draws a clear distinction between two kinds of inconsistency-inconsecutiveness in reasoning, and inconstancy of opinion. Jowett, he admits, had both. He had not the 'wonderful hardihood in speculation' which Macaulay ascribes to Plato, 'who shrank from nothing to which his principles led.' As the author of Psalm xxxi. when he says, 'Be thou my strong rock, for thou art my rock,' employs the reasoning of the heart and affections rather than of the understanding; as the method of St. Paul is inconsecutive, and never in the technical sense logical, troubling itself little about apparent paradoxes and contradictions; as St. Augustine's better instincts wrung from his reluctant reason a mitigation of the extreme terrors of his theology in favour of infants who knew not right or wrong, so it was with Jowett. He refused (to use his own expression) to 'fall under the dominion of logic' (p. 63). And as to inconsistency of the second kind, like any wise man who follows the movement and varying circumstances of his age, he did not hesitate to modify his earlier opinions if he had good grounds for doing so. As Mr. Smalley says in his Studies of Men, he took the liberty of being himself and not somebody else. He had taken a wide survey of the fields of theology and philosophy and mastered their literature, but his mind could not work in a groove cut out by any school or any party, and it was so constituted that it could not but look

¹ This is, of course, not to be pressed unduly. Jowett was not opposed to logic in itself, but to its abuse. Tollemache mentions how in the formation of his style he was particularly cautioned by the Master 'to be careful about the orderly and logical arrangement of his sentences' (p. 12), and light is thrown on this point by what he says on p. 66: 'In an essay on the province of logic, I said that the use of logic is less for the discovery of truth than for the detection of error, and less for the detection of error than for its exposure, and from Jowett's strong expression of approval I saw that I had hit off his view exactly.'

at every side of a subject—dispassionately and impartially. Mr. Tollemache states this well where he says (p. 81):

'The Master, as the French would say, had the good qualities belonging to his defects. Through his habit of taking a link of a chain of reasoning by itself and detaching it from the link before and the link after, he could both examine that link better and describe it better. Hence it was that his aperçus were often brilliant and brilliantly expressed.'

And he puts the matter shortly on p. 135:

'Neither with Montaigne nor with Pascal, neither with Pattison nor with Liddon, was he completely in accord. His heart was the heart of an Idealist, but his head was the head of a Sceptic.'

Much food for reflection is provided in what we are here told of Jowett's peculiar attitude towards such large subjects as prayer, metaphysics (he once protested paradoxically that its chief use was to get rid of metaphysics altogether), German philosophy, liberalism, and progress; towards art, which he held to be 'the bloom of decay;' towards the highest criticism of our age, which he sometimes made the ultimate court of appeal; and the growth of journalism, which he regarded with suspicion. In his treatment of all these topics we see his characteristic indefiniteness and yet at the same time his strong individuality. He is nothing if he is not original. But it is sometimes rather difficult to distinguish between what he approvingly quotes and what he actually and deliberately holds.

Having been all his life a teacher of the young, he kept his eye on small faults, which are liable to become serious, and we admire the way in which he yet steered clear of pedagogism. Here, too, Mr. Tollemache lays his finger on

his weakness as well as his strength:

'He tried to be a philosopher, moralist, and preceptor, all at once. As a philosopher, he looked at the world from the outside; and, so looking, he dimly perceived—or (what is much the same thing) he was conscious of trying not to perceive—that all is vanity. As a moralist, he looked at the world from inside, and almost convinced himself that all is an intense reality. I hope it is not an overstrained metaphor to add that, if he looked at the world with one eye, as it were, from the outside, and with the other eye from the inside, the result could hardly fail to be an occasional obliquity of moral vision' (p. 54).

Again:

'As a philosopher he did not believe in the heinousness of sin; but as a moralist he did believe in it' (p. 124).

thailike what refinee pow

1896

thir (apa pra that poin Car par of r

he whi relig mor less Car

hist

or 'Joy But which of I stor

an e and what a ha will he the the

stim

ualities link of before escribe nt and

Jan.

tially.

on nor

e here ects as hat its erman ich he iighest timate ich he topics e same is not nguish ctually

e kept erious, ear of ger on at once.

As a anvinced in overith one com the quity of

in; but

His estimates of men of mark were no less characteristic than those of systems of philosophy and religion. He disliked the pessimism of Carlyle, and asked more than once what lasting effect he had produced upon the world. To his refined ear it was natural that Browning's style should seem needlessly cumbrous and distorted, though he admitted his power. Taking exception to a statement in the Saturday Review that we had one poet of the first order, he said, 'I think that Browning deserves a shady first.' Of Voltaire (apart from his infidel opinions) he generally spoke with praise. Civilization, he considered, owed more to Voltaire than to all the Fathers of the Church put together; and in point of wit he ranked him above Swift. His judgment on Cardinal Newman was severe. He described him as comparatively 'indifferent to truth and morality in the province of religion; ' an accusation the first part of which he softened down to mean that the Cardinal did not apply to the sacred history and literature of Palestine, and to the history and literature of the Church, the same canons of criticism which he would have applied to any other history or literature; while as to the graver charge of indifference to morality in religious matters, what he complained of was, that the lax morality seen in the earlier stages of Jewish history produced less effect on him than it ought to have done on a man of Cardinal Newman's ability in the nineteenth century.

It would be easy to multiply illustrations of Jowett's conversation and of the versatility of his intellect from this memoir. Nearly every page sparkles with some racy remark or some telling anecdote. We forbear to quote from the 'Jowett traditions so dear to undergraduates and gossips.' But we may be permitted, in connexion with the question to which Mr. Tollemache devotes five pages, whether the Master of Balliol had much sense of humour, to repeat the following story, not recorded in this volume, but in Mr. Smalley's Studies of Men.'

'There was a backward student at Balliol who, for failure to pass an examination in Greek, was "sent down." His mother, a good and devout mother, went to see the Master. She explained to him what an excellent lad her son was; how filial and how pious. "It is a hard experience for him, this disgrace," said the old lady; "but he will have the consolations of religion, and there is always one book to which he can turn." Jowett eyed her, and answered, "Yes, madam, the Greek grammar. Good morning" (p. 164).

In conclusion, we would notice his marvellous power of stimulating work—not merely College or University work.

:As the late Lord Coleridge said at the great meeting held in London to consider the best form of memorial to the Master of Balliol: 'No one was even twenty minutes with him without being distinctly invited to do something more than he had hitherto done, to take advantage of his position or opportunities to make the world better.' Joined to this, and, what is rarer, united also with great subtlety of intellect, was the most transparent simplicity of his nature. No one ever imputed to Jowett, in matters great or small, that he studied his own interests. Last, but not least, was his sustained hopefulness and cheerfulness, the outcome of wide reading and study of the past, together with deep meditation on the problems of modern times. He brought a genial atmosphere with him into social life, 'wearing all that weight of learning lightly like a flower.' There was not visible in him the slightest particle of the bitterness too often engendered by differences of opinion, none of the restlessness or discontent, 'the deep unchristian sadness and anxiety' with which our age is infected. After comparing him in some respects with Amiel, Mr. Tollemache sums up his recollections of his friend in some carefully weighed sentences:

'He thought with the Rationalists, but felt with the Christians. Perhaps it is not too fanciful to say that, being tossed on the sea of doubt and scepticism, and drifting further and further from his old moorings, he was yet attached to those moorings by an indefinitely elastic cable, and by a golden anchor—the elastic cable of the Imagination and the golden anchor of Hope. . . . He was one of those happily constituted persons who keep alive the hope which is born of an ardent wish, and is its own and its only justification—the hope that there is an Ideal World in which Absolute Goodness, of which the highest earthly goodness is but a feeble and transient reflection, has its habitation in perfect fullness and for ever' (p. 140).

The Athenians, according to some ancient writers, repented after they had put Socrates to death, and set up statues to him. Benjamin Jowett witnessed a similar revolution of feeling in our modern Athens, which had once persecuted him for his opinions. He lived on there in an honoured old age, acknowledged as the prime mover in whatever is of most value in the changes she has undergone in our day. Memorials in tablet and bust are shortly to be crected to him in Balliol Chapel and also in the Bodleian Library. But his best monument is in the loving hearts and affections of the long roll of his disciples, and in the great College which he served so faithfully to the end.

4

1896

I. N

IT is lish I its e tions histo some series sent. stop once if it woul the c a poi man acco camp but .

battl

Engl

Quan

for the not, to its to eccount men in the take. The justile strug of corema

powe

## ART. IX.—NELSON AND NAVAL WARFARE.

 Nelson. By JOHN KNOX LAUGHTON. 'English Men of Action' Series. (London, 1895.)

2. The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1793-1812. By Captain A. T. MAHAN, U.S.N. (London, 1893.)

IT is strange that a series of biographies dealing with 'English Men of Action' should have reached the sixth year of its existence and the twenty-second number of its publications before including a volume on the greatest sailor of our history. Drake, Rodney, Cook, Dundonald, and even that somewhat squalid hero, Dampier, had all been enrolled in the series, but the name of Nelson remained unaccountably absent. It can hardly have been that Southey's Life of Nelson stopped the way. We take leave even to doubt whether that once celebrated work is very largely read to-day; and even if it were, there would still be room for a biography which would treat of Nelson less as the popular hero and more as the consummate master of naval strategy and tactics. It is a point of view of which even the average educated Englishman is strangely ignorant. Most of us could give a coherent account of Waterloo, or explain the bearing of the Peninsular campaigns on the general fortune of the war with Napoleon; but how many can appreciate the strategic necessity of the battle of the Baltic or the rationale of the formation of the English fleet at Trafalgar?

To some it may seem that the pages of the Church Quarterly Review are not the proper place in which to seek for the answer to questions such as these. The objection is not, we think, well founded. In a Review which, in addition to its primary purpose, embraces subjects of general interest to educated persons, the military and naval history of our country may rightly find its share of notice. English Churchmen are Englishmen as well. They have a right to feel pride in the great achievements of their nation in the past, and to take an interest in all that concerns its welfare in the future. The study of the naval side of the great Napoleonic war is justified upon both of these grounds. The evil passions of the struggle have died away; there remain the lessons of courage, of constancy, of endurance, which are imperishable. There remain likewise lessons as to the character and extent of sea power, which are as true to-day as they ever were, and have

wide tation genial that not often

Jan.

eld in Iaster

him

on or

t, was

ever

at he

ssness kiety' im in p his sen-

stians. sea of his old finitely Imagithose s born e hope which ection,

s, reet up
revoonce
in an
er in
ergone
to be
dleian
ts and
great

the most direct bearing upon the present position and future

prospects of our country.

These last-mentioned lessons have been brought home to us within the last two years by the very remarkable book which holds the second place at the head of this article. It has been reserved for an officer in the United States navy, in this book and its predecessor (The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783), to make Englishmen appreciate the full meaning of that naval power which has made them a great nation. The names of our great sea fights have, of course, been household words with us almost from our cradles; but the results of those fights, the nature of the power which lies in maritime supremacy, have seldom been adequately comprehended by the average Englishman. If they had been so comprehended there could never have been in the mind of any one, whether minister or elector, any indifference as to the maintenance of the English navy in full strength and efficiency. If occasion should arise in the present generation for the active employment of England's warlike strength, it will be due in no small measure to Captain Mahan if our fleet is in a position to assert our old supremacy and to secure our coasts from danger; and if the occasion should not arise it will again be due to him in no small measure that the strength of our fleet is such as to deter our enemies from aggression and enable our statesmen to speak for peace in the councils of Europe with a fitting. weight and authority.

The great Napoleonic war is the most striking proof in history of the enormous efficacy of sea power. Even the struggle with Spain in the days of Elizabeth furnishes no such spectacle as that of England holding out alone against Napoleon, at a time when he not only wielded with his transcendent military ability the full force of victorious France, but also dominated and directed the policy of every State in prostrate Europe. Had England not been an island, nothing, humanly speaking, could have saved her from the fate of Austria and Prussia; but those few miles of sea, accompanied by that predominance in naval power which they had led us to acquire, not only secured our safety, but enabled us to put such a stress upon Napoleon as, in the end, brought down the whole fabric of empire in a crash about his ears. Behind the Russian snows, behind the Spanish 'ulcer' lay the silent pressure of the British ships, forcing him on to the desperate venture of the one, nourishing and intensifying the other.

1896 that

part Britis at T T Nels Laug sailo

N

of hi to le an a the : was whic tions by a not lucid which

no p

attra

cour

case part mak tion side thro is th had port brot atte Hor of th to th Arc

the rem shot gav inte

Con

future

Jan.

ome to book le. It avy, in

Power reciate hem a ave, of m our

of the n been an. If e been iny in-

in full e pregland's o Cap-

our old if the in no as to

esmen

fitting . roof in en the hes no gainst th his

torious every en an d her iles of which

ty, but e end, out his ulcer' on to

sifying

No part of Captain Mahan's work is more striking than that in which he traces the decisive, though easily overlooked, part played during the last ten years of the contest by the British naval supremacy which had been finally established at Trafalgar.

The establishment of that supremacy was the work of Nelson, and it needed neither Captain Mahan nor Professor Laughton to make the nation recognize in him 'the greatest sailor since our world began.' But as to the precise character of his genius we suspect that many Englishmen have much to learn; and they will find Professor Laughton's little book an admirable guide. It is written with a full knowledge of the subject, with the advantage of much information which was not accessible to Southey, and with a seamanship to which Southey made no claim. Many popular misconceptions, both as to his life and as to his genius, will be removed by a study of this clear and painstaking biography. It may not have the literary qualities of Southey's work, but it has lucidity, accuracy, and sobriety of judgment; and a narrative which has to tell the stories of the Nile and Trafalgar needs no picturesque additions or artistic brightening to make it attractive and even thrilling.

Nelson was born on Michaelmas Day 1758. The unaccountability of genius is conspicuously exemplified in his His grandfather and father were clergymen of no particular note; his brothers were likewise clergymen, and make no appearance in his life except by repeated applications to him to secure them preferment. On his mother's side Professor Laughton makes out a distant connexion, through sundry marriages, with the fighting Veres; and that is the best that the genealogist can do for him. But if he had no ancestors to speak of, he had what was more important—an uncle. This was Captain Suckling, his mother's brother, who executed to the full the recognized duty of attending to the worldly advancement of his relations. He took Horatio Nelson on board his ship as midshipman at the age of thirteen, got him sent out first on a merchant ship trading to the West Indies, and then on a voyage of discovery in the Arctic regions; and subsequently, when he had become Comptroller of the Navy, secured his rapid advancement to the rank of captain by the time he was twenty-one. It is remarkable that our greatest sea and land commanders should have owed their advancement to the positions which gave them their opportunities almost entirely to family interest. Wellesley was a colonel at twenty-four and Nelson

had

for

ene

with

mos

can

in t

infe

of t

Fre

onc

goo

aga

ing,

the

wer

this

Rev

and

ther

coun

in d

tum

neig

so n

At .

by 1

the

At

Nati

prac

of I

colo

a captain at twenty-one, in each case without having seen any real active service.

The early years of Nelson's service as a captain were those of the American war, and during most of it he was upon the North American station; but fortune did not bring any fighting in his way. At the time of Rodney's great battle, on April 12, 1782, which recovered our lost command of the sea and enabled us to make an honourable peace, he was in Ireland, waiting for a convoy to America; and the war closed without bringing him advancement. afterwards he had the fortune to make the acquaintance and win the approbation of Lord Hood and of the sailor prince who subsequently became Duke of Clarence and King William IV. Lord Hood invited Nelson to accompany him to the West Indies, and on that station he spent nearly five years. This period was chiefly remarkable for a dispute with the commander-in-chief of the station, Sir R. Hughes, in which Nelson was technically wrong but substantially right, and for his marriage with the widow of a Dr. Nisbet. He was married in March 1787, came home in the following July, and was unemployed until the outbreak of war with France at the beginning of 1793.

It is at this point that Captain Mahan's history commences, and his second chapter goes far to explain the course which the naval war subsequently took. During the the Seven Years' War and the war of American Independence the English and French fleets had met upon not unequal Hawke's victory in Quiberon Bay and Rodney's defeat of De Grasse were the only decisive English successes during the period; and, on the other hand, the French admirals had more than once rejected excellent opportunities of crushing inferior English forces. If we had held, on the whole, the command of the sea (except for one vitally important moment on the North American coast), it was largely because the French had never fought for it. Their principle was that their squadrons were to be used for 'ulterior objects' -the capture of an island, the blockade of a port, the covering of a military expedition, or the like-and for the sake of these ulterior objects they repeatedly avoided occasions for conflict with the fleets of their opponent, or, if an action were forced upon them, sought to render it indecisive. ditions under which sailing ships manœuvred favoured the execution of this policy. If the French had the wind they could simply refuse to take advantage of it, and their enemy could not get at them from leeward; while if the English

whice troul dem when grou

his c

shou

again

Revo

n any were e was bring great mand ice, he nd the hortly e and prince King y him ly five e with nes, in right, le was ly, and at the comin the ng the ndence nequal odney's h suc-French unities on the lly imlargely rinciple bjects' coversake of ons for on were he conred the d they had the wind favourable for attack, it was likewise favourable for the French to retreat, and a cannonade directed at their enemy's rigging could be counted on to prevent his pursuing with a force adequate to compel a decisive action. Hence most of the engagements of the war resolved themselves into cannonades at a respectful distance, and there was nothing in these to show that the French were to any marked degree inferior to the English either in men or in ships. The war of the French Revolution tells a very different tale. The French ships, indeed, were generally good enough, and when once they had been captured they were able to give a very good account of themselves; and the men showed, time and again, that they were not deficient in courage. But in training, in seamanship, in all that makes the difference between the landsman and the sailor, the French during this period were infinitely inferior to their adversaries. The reason for this is not far to seek, and it is directly traceable to the Revolution. The officers of the old navy had been nobles and gentlemen, and the Revolution would have none of them. Some were executed or murdered in the ordinary course of the Terror; many left the service or the country in disgust; and those that remained were treated with contumely by their crews. When every man was as good as his neighbour, and a little better too, the strict discipline which is so necessary to naval efficiency simply could not be enforced. At Toulon two successive commanders were dragged to prison by the mob merely for enforcing ordinary discipline, while the local authorities backed up the proceedings of the mob. At Brest the crews mutinied against the admiral, and the National Assembly allowed him to retire, without taking any practical steps towards supporting his authority. At the Isle of France the naval commandant was murdered by the colonial troops themselves. The various legislative bodies which directed the administration of France during these troubled years added to the confusion by their attempts to democratize the fleet. The height of absurdity was reached when the corps of marine artillerists was suppressed, on the ground that every citizen had an equal right to fight for his country, and that it was intolerable that one corps alone should have the privilege of pointing the guns of the fleet against an enemy.

Under circumstances such as these it is not unnatural that the efficiency of an English ship during the war of the Revolution was greatly superior to that of a French ship, and that in gunnery especially the superiority was very

enemy

English

each

ship

line

This

ship

and

his c

carri

nece

itseli

the 1

hour

then

take

had

held

cripp

How

his :

dama

had

in fir

unqu

fact

enga

fight

glory

only

the v

come

spicu

war l

64-g1

squa

servi

playe

Duri

right

face havir

but 1

cesso

decis

Nels

marked. In one action 'five French ships had three of the enemy under their fire for several hours; only thirteen Englishmen were killed, and no ship so crippled as to be taken.' In another, a few days later, eight British ships fought twelve French. 'The whole British loss was 144 killed and wounded. Three French ships struck, with a loss of 670; and the nine others, which had been partially engaged, had a total of 222 killed and wounded.' Nor did matters improve as the war went on. The French fleets were generally blockaded in their ports, and could get little or no exercise at sea. The English fleets were continually at sea, constantly increasing in efficiency and experience. It was thus that English sailors could venture, and bring to a successful conclusion, those astonishing deeds of which our naval story-books are full.

In the first great battle of the war Nelson had no share. It was fought in the Atlantic, while he was engaged in the Mediterranean. The occasion of it was the necessity which the French were under, owing to the failure of their harvest, of importing a convoy of provisions from the United States. To intercept this convoy the main English fleet, under Lord Howe, sailed from Spithead on May 2, 1794, and a fortnight later the French fleet, under Villaret, put out from Brest to cover it. It was not until the 28th that Howe sighted his enemy, and four days of manœuvring and partial engagements followed before the great battle was fought. When they first met each fleet consisted of twenty-six ships of the line, the French having the advantage of the wind. At the end of the second day Howe had forced his way from leeward to windward, so as to secure the command of the wind, and four French ships had been put out of action, and another crippled, as against one disabled on the English side. On the third day a fog stopped hostilities, and Villaret had the good luck to be joined by four fresh ships, which restored the equality of force. On the fourth day Howe regained touch with his enemy, but too late to engage before nightfall. When day dawned on June I, however, the fleets were found in the same relative positions, and Howe at once bore down with the wind and commenced the action. The two fleets were running parallel to one another, each in single line, the French having twentysix ships and the English twenty-five. Howe's plan was that

<sup>1</sup> Mahan, i. 59.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 60. On another occasion (ibid. p. 307, note), during Admiral Bruix's cruise in 1799, a French officer states that 'at least nine hundred guns were fired in very fine weather at an Algerian corsair without doing any harm.'

Jan.

the

ing-

en.' 1

elve

ded. nine

222

war

ing-

g in ilors

hose

hare.

the

hich

vest.

ates.

Lord

night

st to

gage-

Vhen

fthe

t the

lee-

wind, other

n the

good

ality

day

ne re-

d and

rallel

enty-

that

g Ad-

t nine

corsair

each ship should mark as its adversary the corresponding ship of the enemy's line, and should pass through the French line and engage its opponent on the further, or leeward, side. This manœuvre would cut off the retreat of any crippled ships, which would be unable to make progress to windward; and for the result of the battle he trusted to the superiority of his own fleet, ship to ship. This plan could only partially be carried out, as it was not possible for every ship to find the necessary interval in the French line, and the battle resolved itself into a confused mêlée. In this the superior gunnery of the English gave them the advantage, and, when, after some hours of fight, the rival commanders gathered their fleets round them, seven disabled French ships were found either already taken or at the mercy of the English, while one, the Vengeur, had sunk, after a desperate duel with the Brunswick. It was held by many that, with a little more energy, several more crippled French ships might have been secured; but Lord Howe, who was over sixty-eight, was physically exhausted; his second in command was alarmed on account of the damage suffered by many of the ships; some of the captains had shown themselves incompetent or unsatisfactory; so that, in fine, nothing more was done. The victory was brilliant and unquestionable, even though it was not crushing; and the fact that the convoy, which was the original cause of the engagement, made its way safely into Brest shortly after the fight, passed comparatively unnoticed in the blaze of military glory with which Howe was covered on his return.

The battle of the First of June is worth describing, not only for its own sake, but for the purpose of comparison with the very different tactics of Nelson in the years that were to come. His own service meanwhile had been of a less conspicuous, but still successful, character. At the outbreak of war he had been given the command of the Agamemnon, a 64-gun ship, and had been attached to the Mediterranean squadron under Lord Hood. Hood detached him for special service in the Gulf of Genoa and about Corsica, where he played a principal part in the captures of Bastia and Calvi. During the siege of the latter place he lost the sight of his right eye through a shot which drove some gravel into his face from the parapet of a battery under his charge. Corsica having been reduced, he rejoined the main fleet before Toulon; but Hood had returned to England, and Hotham, his successor, was content to observe the French fleet and to avoid decisive actions even when a good opportunity offered. Nelson in the Agamemnon had one sharp action with a

VOL. XLI .- NO. LXXXII.

HH

com

rapi

min

in the

was

now

was

latte

ven

tion

agai

the

amo

Terv

Mar

(Ne

unit

on i

by a

the !

carr

fiftee

but '

Day

off (

esser

attac

for C

One

of ei

divis

Jervi

divis

at th

passe

SUCCE

runn

and

simp

this;

French ship of superior force, the Ca ira, which resulted in the latter being reduced to a wreck, and finally taken on the following day; but on the whole he was forced to spend his time in lamenting over Hotham's indecision and sighing for the return of Lord Hood. Twice or thrice opportunities occurred which, had Nelson been in command, must have resulted in crushing victories; but Hotham's prudence held him back, and no general action took place. The consequences of these failures were serious, for if the Toulon fleet had been crushed it would have been possible to sparc sufficient ships for the patrolling of the Gulf of Genoa. Nelson was detached for this duty, but only with a single ship; and he never ceased to declare that with adequate force he could have cut off all the supplies for the French army in Italy, which passed along the Riviera and in small boats along the coast, and so have made Napoleon's brilliant campaign of 1796 completely impossible.

The year 1795 was, in fact, one of comparative inaction on the part of the English naval authorities. Howe had retired from the chief command, and had been succeeded by Lord Bridport, who, with a force of fourteen ships, had an excellent chance of destroying a squadron of nine under Villaret, but suffered it to escape with the loss of three of its number. Captain Mahan well remarks, 'Such was the extreme circumspection characterizing the early naval operations of the British, until Jervis and Nelson enkindled their service with the reckless energy of spirit inspired by Bonaparte on land.'1 A change, indeed, came over the conduct of the war when Sir John Jervis was appointed, at the end of 1795, to supersede Hotham in the Mediterranean. Captain Mahan's estimate of his character deserves quotation, for if Nelson was the greatest of our naval commanders Jervis was the great administrator who made his successes possible, and whose firm hand controlled the naval policy of England during the most important

period of the war.

'Though not an ungenerous man, Lord St. Vincent lacked the sympathetic qualities that made Nelson at once so lovable and so great a leader of men. Escaping the erratic temper and the foibles of his great successor, upon whose career these defects have left marks ever to be regretted by those who love his memory, Jervis fell short too of the inspiration, of the ardour which in moments of difficulty lifted Nelson far above the common plane of mankind, and have stamped his actions with the seal of genius. But after Nelson, Jervis, though of a different order, stands first among British

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mahan, i. 178.

ted in on the and his ing for unities t have be held conseon fleet arc suf-Nelson p; and e could n Italy,

ong the

lan.

aign of ction on retired y Lord xcellent ret, but number. eme cirs of the ice with land.'1 when Sir upersede imate of greatest nistrator and connportant

acked the ole and so the foibles have left Jervis fell oments of akind, and er Nelson, ng British commanders-in-chief. For inspiration he had a cool, sound, and rapid professional judgment; for ardour a steady, unflinching determination to succeed; and these, joined to a perfect fearlessness of responsibility such as Nelson also showed, have won for him a place in the first rank of those chieftains, whether sea or land, who have not received the exceptional endowments of Nature's favourites.'

During 1796 the presence of Jervis with the English fleet was chiefly shown in the strict blockade of Toulon which was now maintained, a blockade in which the besieging squadron was rarely equal in number to the besieged, but in which the latter, aware of the bad quality of many of their ships, never ventured to challenge the blockaders' superiority. The situation was changed, however, by the Spanish declaration of war against England in the autumn of that year, which threw into the opposing scale a navy of fifty ships, some of which were among the largest specimens of naval architecture afloat. Jervis had fifteen ships before Toulon, seven (under Admiral Man) before Cadiz; and although Corsica had to be evacuated (Nelson having charge of the movement) he was prepared to unite his forces upon Elba as a base and maintain his hold on the Mediterranean. Unluckily Man, having been chased by a Spanish fleet of nineteen sail, made up his mind that the Mediterranean was unsafe, and, instead of rejoining Jervis, carried off his squadron to England. Jervis, thus reduced to fifteen ships against the allies' thirty-eight, had no alternative but to fall back on Gibraltar.

It was with fifteen ships that Jervis on St. Valentine's Day 1797 fell in with the Spanish fleet of twenty-seven sail off Cape St. Vincent; and muttering, 'A victory is very essential to England at this moment, he did not hesitate to attack. The Spaniards were in two confused masses, heading for Cadiz, and Jervis thrust his line between the two divisions. One division, with eighteen ships, lay to windward; the other, of eight (one having made off), to leeward. The windward division was heading in the opposite direction to that of Jervis's line, and to attack it, while still keeping off the lee division, he ordered his ships to tack in succession and strike at the rear of the retreating Spaniards. As the English ships passed them, each making for the spot at which they were successively to tack, the Spaniards conceived the idea of running down to leeward across the rear of the English line, and so rejoining their lee division. Had Jervis's order been simply carried out there would have been nothing to prevent this; but Nelson, whose ship, the Captain, was third from the

1 Ibid. i. 205.

and

to

line

tion

was

the

who

vid

nov

rou

Egy

Wh

sail

stri

retu

Fre

mus

Ale

batt

cisiv

stan

it in

the

of h

and

a la

ente

shut

fron

his o

any

his l

had

Frei

anch

and

ships

com

only

but e

ably

a fle

British rear, on his own initiative swung back out of the line and threw himself across the Spanish van. This brilliant movement checked the Spaniards; Jervis signalled to Collingwood, in the rearmost ship, to support Nelson, and simultaneously the leading English ships overtook their enemy and the action became general. The Captain, which had borne the brunt of the fighting alone for some time, was little better than a wreck, and Collingwood, seeing her hard pressed, made up to the rescue, and poured a destructive broadside into her principal opponent, the San Nicolas. The San Nicolas fell aboard the San Josef, and Nelson, seeing that his ship could no longer manœuvre, threw her alongside the former and boarded her. Having driven the Spaniards below, he called for fresh boarders and proceeded to carry the San Josef, which lay on the further side; and on her quarter-deck, in a well-known dramatic scene, he received the swords of the Spanish officers.

Four Spanish ships had been taken and many of the rest roughly handled; above all, the worthlessness of the Spanish navy had been revealed and the efficiency of the English vindicated. Nelson in particular, whose initiative had prevented the action becoming an indecisive cannonade, and who, in a 74-gun ship, had taken an 80 and a 112, was the hero of the hour; and from this moment dates his hold upon the popular imagination. The fear of invasion was removed, and

confidence in the navy was re-established.

The victory of Cape St. Vincent was followed by a long blockade of Cadiz, closely maintained by Jervis (now Lord St. Vincent) and Nelson, who had become rear-admiral. For general history the most important incident is the mutiny which ran through the whole British navy in 1797, and which Jervis kept down, by prompt and unflinching severity, in the squadron off Cadiz; in Nelson's personal career the chief event is his unsuccessful attempt on Teneriffe, in which he lost his right arm. He was invalided for several months, suffering intense pain; and on his recovery he once more joined St. Vincent off Cadiz in April 1798. He was not now, however, to be detained on a tedious, though necessary, blockade. A French force was known to be gathering at Toulon, and Nelson was despatched with a small squadron to reconnoitre it. He found it in Toulon; but when he returned, after a heavy gale, in which his ship, the Vanguard, had been dismasted, to look for it again, it was gone. At this moment instructions reached St. Vincent to send a squadron up the Mediterranean, and suggesting Nelson as the commander;

Jan,

e line

lliant

Col-

and

nemy

had

hard

uctive

that

le the

pelow,

e San

-deck.

of the

e rest

oanish

nglish

d pre-

d who,

ero of

on the

d, and

a long

Lord

. For

nutiny

which

in the

e chief

ich he

nonths,

e more

ot now,

essary,

ring at

dron to

eturned,

ad been

noment

up the

nander;

The

and in accordance with these orders reinforcements were sent to the latter, bringing his force up to thirteen ships of the line, with instructions to find and destroy the enemy's expedi-So began Nelson's first independent command, which

was made memorable by the victory of the Nile.

The details of the campaign are well known, and illustrate the difficulty which a fleet may have in finding its enemy, when, as was the case with Nelson, it is insufficiently provided with small vessels for scouts. Bonaparte, as we know now, was making for Egypt, only stopping to take Malta en route; but Nelson had no means of determining whether Egypt, Naples, Sicily, Portugal, or Ireland was his object. When at length he heard that the French had left Malta, sailing eastwards, he hurried to Egypt, so rapidly as to outstrip his enemy; and, finding no signs of him in Alexandria, returned at once to Syracuse, leaving the coast clear for the French landing in Egypt. In Sicily he learnt that the enemy must, after all, be to the east of him, and, hastening back to Alexandria, saw that city in the hands of the French, and their

battle-ships drawn up at anchor in Aboukir Bay.

The battle of the Nile (August 1, 1798) is the most decisive engagement in naval history, and remains for ever a standing model of naval tactics. Now that we look back on it in the past it is easy to see how it was so, and to blame the French admiral for having given himself into the hands of his enemy. Brueys, with his thirteen line-of-battle ships and four frigates, lay at anchor in Aboukir Bay, just outside a large shoal. Bonaparte had repeatedly pressed him to enter the harbour of Alexandria, but he was unwilling to shut himself up in a harbour subject to bombardment and from which it is difficult to get out, and continued to lie in his open anchorage, expecting no battle, but believing that in any case his position was secure. The event terribly refuted his belief, but Professor Laughton 1 rightly points out that it had plausibility. Within the last sixteen years superior French forces had twice refused to attack English squadrons anchored in line of battle with their flanks covered by the shore, and English fleets had twice abstained from attacking French ships in similar positions. It is true that Hood, who was in command, had on both occasions intended to attack, and was only prevented from doing so by accidental circumstances; but of this Brueys could not be aware, and he might reasonably believe his position to be the best defensive attitude for a fleet to assume. What is more pertinent is that his manner

<sup>1</sup> Nelson, p. 118.

ash

ship

was

nav

poir

prad

thei

mer

Free

Pru

at so

orde

forc

sim

the

Nels

resu

take

Eng

It is

tuni

opp

of I

cron

brin

thro

he v

is ti

grea

ing

as r

begi

this

treat

not

It ha

rece

of executing his plan was inefficient, for he had left a space between his van ship and the shore—not much, it is true, but enough to cause the ruin of his fleet. Also, not dreaming of the possibility of an enemy passing inshore of his line, he had allowed his guns on the landward broadsides to be cumbered with all kinds of impedimenta. Retribution was swift and

overwhelming.

Nelson's plan of action had been discussed with his captains during the pursuit, and though it was already late in the afternoon when he came in sight of the enemy there was no hesitation or delay. Admirably piloted by Captain Hood of the Zealous, the main body of the fleet moved steadily into action. Nelson's plan was to concentrate his whole fleet on the leading French ships, and so to destroy each in turn by superior force. It mattered little whether the first ships attacked on one side or the other, but Foley, in the Goliath, boldly passed inshore of the first French ship, and as the sun went down anchored on the bow of the second. The four next ships followed him and ranged themselves on the port sides of the five vessels of the French van. Then Nelson, in the Vanguard, set the example of passing on the outer side of the enemy's line, and the remaining ships followed him, each pouring, as they passed, a crashing broadside into the already shattered van of the enemy. The English had only twelve ships in action (the Culloden having gone aground) and a frigate, the French thirteen ships and four frigates, carrying more guns and of heavier metal; but Nelson's tactics completely reversed this nominal superiority, for the first ten of the English ships were engaged with seven of the French, and the two last, which were some distance behind, came up in time to complete the work of destruction. The wind blew down the French line, so that the rear ships could not move to the support of their comrades, and could only watch disaster draw nearer to themselves. Through half of the summer night the French fought gallantly, and the losses were not all on their side. The Bellerophon, engaging with her seventy-four guns the gigantic Orient, of 120, was driven wrecked out of the fight; the Majestic got her rigging entangled with that of the Heureux, and suffered much loss for a time in a position from which she could not reply. But these accidents could not delay the result. At ten the Orient, which had been attacked at different times by four British ships, blew up; and before midnight six other French ships had surrendered, and three more were disabled. These three were attacked next morning and surrendered, while a fourth ran

XUM

Jan.

pace

, but

ng of

e had

pered

and

cap-

n the

as no

od of

into

et on

turn

ships

liath.

e sun

four

ashore and was burnt by her own crew. Two only of all the ships of the line escaped. Of the frigates one was sunk, one

was burnt, and two escaped. In this battle Nelson exemplified the supreme principle of naval (as of military) tactics, that decisive effects can only be obtained by bringing an overwhelming force to bear on one point in the enemy's array. It sounds simple, and yet it was practically new, both by land and sea, in the days of Nelson and Napoleon. Condé and Marlborough joined battle with their opponents along their whole line at once, and their merit lay in seizing the point at which the enemy began to waver, and in making their supreme effort at that spot. Frederick won his battles through the superior mobility of the Prussian armies and his own inexhaustible activity. So too at sea, in the days of Rodney and Suffren, the hostile fleets moved past one another in parallel lines, cannonading with order and decorum as they passed. Howe, on June 1, forced on a more decisive action than these, but he aimed simply at laying the two fleets broadside to broadside, leaving the issue to be fought out, ship by ship, in single combat. Nelson's tactics were those of Austerlitz and Jena, and the results were the same. No doubt his adversary made mistakes, as did the generals opposed to Napoleon; but Brueys made no more mistakes than other French admirals (and English too, for the matter of that) had made before him. It is Nelson's glory that he made the fullest use of the opportunity that lay to his hand; and war is so full of lost opportunities that this is no light praise.

The victory of the Nile brought down Bonaparte's edifice of Eastern conquest with a crash, though Sir Ralph Abercrombie's brilliant campaign, three years later, was needed to bring the drama to its end. Nelson was the hero of the hour throughout Europe, and on his return to Naples in September he was received with transports of joy. The name of Naples is tinged with no pleasant associations for the reader of our great sailor's life; not on account of the episode of the hanging of Caracciolo (which Professor Laughton explains in so convincing a manner that it should never again be regarded as reflecting the least discredit upon Nelson), but for the beginning of his acquaintance with Lady Hamilton. Into this episode we do not propose to enter. Professor Laughton's treatment of it is at once candid and judicious. He does not excuse it, but he does something towards explaining it. It has been made clear (by the publication of documents in recent years) that Lady Hamilton's own statements in later

port on, in r side him, to the d only 1) and rying comten of rench, me up blew move h dismmer not all y-four

out of

hat of

posi-

idents

h had

, blew

d sur-

e were

th ran

fo

tic

M

W

th

CC

W

bi

P

he

m

CE

es

no

to

gı

of

n

h

th

de

in

H

h

al

tr

ai

st

fa

m

life about the course of public affairs are totally untrust-worthy, and that Nelson did not subordinate public interests to his private passion to the extent that has been sometimes supposed. The moral fault remains the same, and here it can only be said that Nelson, with all the fine attributes of genius, had also that not uncommon failing of genius, a sense that ordinary rules are not made for it, and that its own ardent desires are a sufficient law for itself. This is to explain, not to excuse; and we can but echo Browning's words on another erring hero of our history:

'I'm no Clive, nor parson either: Clive's worst deed we'll hope condoned.'

For some years after the battle of the Nile the French fleet practically resigned the contest. It is true that a numerically strong squadron was in Brest harbour, and that in 1799 Admiral Bruix escaped thence with twenty-five sail, and entered the Mediterranean, where he might have inflicted great damage on the scattered English detachments then engaged about Minorca, Malta, Naples, and Cadiz, had he made the most of his opportunity. But either Bruix feared his fate too much or (as may reasonably be expected) the desert of his ships was small, and his cruise ended in his return to Brest with no more definite result than the bringing with him of sixteen more or less unwilling Spanish ships, and the causing of much alarm both to the English Admiralty at home and to St. Vincent in his command off Cadiz. The opportunity was lost and it never came again. In April 1800 St. Vincent was appointed to the command of the Channel fleet, and under his iron rule (continued as First Lord of the Admiralty in 1801) the blockade of Brest became a very different affair from what it had been under Bridport. Henceforward, summer or winter, in rough weather or in fine, an English fleet lay off Brest, with a chain of frigates connecting it with the harbours in which the French were ensconced. The French fleet might indeed put to sea, but it would have to be in weather which would probably be too much for the seamanship of their captains, who had no opportunity of practising their skill out of port, and it was certain that the English fleet would be upon them in a very short space of time. The work of the blockade was infinitely tedious and earned little praise; but it was the key to the whole naval situation, and it will be seen in connexion with the Trafalgar campaign how important the blockade of Brest proved under the vigorous system organized by St. Vincent.

rusterests imes ere it es of sense own olain, is on

Jan.

hope

rench at a that sail. licted n enmade s fate ert of rn to with d the home pporoo St. annel f the very ence-Enging it The to be e seaprac-

t the

time.

arned

ation.

paign

r the

Meanwhile Nelson had practically retired into private life for nearly two years. Having fallen a victim to the attractions of Lady Hamilton, he had no taste for serving in the Mediterranean under Lord Keith, whose orders he more than once disobeyed. His health was, perhaps, shaken by the wound in the head that he had received at the Nile, and he was certainly in an unsettled and irascible frame of mind, so that it was well that the Admiralty granted him leave to come home, which he did in the autumn of 1800, in company with the Hamiltons. His stay in England was brief, and was only remarkable for his final breach with Lady Nelson—a breach inevitable under the circumstances, but to which Professor Laughton thinks Lady Nelson had contributed by her unsympathetic bearing during the past two years. It must have been a relief to many of the parties interested—it certainly is a relief to the reader of Nelson's life-when, in February 1801, he was appointed second in command to an expedition sailing for the Baltic under Sir Hyde Parker.

At the beginning of 1801 England was the only Power at war with France, the resistance of Austria having been crushed at Marengo and Hohenlinden. Not only so, but the northern Powers, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, and Denmark, were in league to resist the right of search claimed by England against neutral ships, and to assert the right of neutral ships to carry on trade with countries which were at war. As the great power of England against France lay in the prohibition of her sea-borne trade, these were principles which she could not admit; and Parker's expedition was intended to bring home to the northern Powers the extreme inadvisability of their conduct. Nelson was anxious to press on at once to Revel, where a Russian squadron of twelve ships lay, and to destroy it before the melting of the ice allowed it to escape into Cronstadt; but Parker was not equal to so bold a stroke. He decided upon attacking the Danes at Copenhagen first; and the execution of this attack he entrusted to Nelson, who had submitted to him a plan of operations. Copenhagen was defended by a line of hulks and floating batteries, and to attack these Nelson took in a squadron of twelve line-of-battle ships and some frigates by a difficult and shallow channel which enabled him to avoid the strongest part of the Danish position. Three of his ships failed to pass the shoals in safety, but the rest, after a desperate cannonade, succeeded in mastering the Danish defences. Several of the Danish ships struck, but reinforcements from the shore constantly renewed the fight and

a

to

eff

It

N

in

hi

of

sti

re

fo

CO

ab

T

m

SU

th

fo

fii

bu

m

bi

W

C

n

n

b

to

Si

th

fo

augmented the slaughter, until Nelson's celebrated letter to the Crown Prince put an end to the carnage. Two legends connected with this fight have been exploded by the latest authorities. The famous story of Nelson's clapping his telescope to his blind eye, and so refusing to see Sir Hyde Parker's signal for discontinuing action, bears a different complexion when it is known that Parker had sent his captain to Nelson with a message that his signal was merely permissive, relieving Nelson of the responsibility if he thought it best to retreat, while leaving him free to continue the action if he chose. Nelson's 'little pantomime' was only a joke, understood by some of the bystanders, though not by all, and the chief credit of the transaction rests with Parker. The other legend is that Nelson's offer of an armistice was merely a ruse to enable him to withdraw his crippled ships in safety past the still uninjured northern batteries of Copenhagen; to which the simple answer is that no English ship stirred from her position until the truce had been confirmed by Parker and it had been agreed that the prizes should be surrendered.

The victory of Copenhagen, due to Nelson's admirable plan of coming into action from a direction which was supposed impracticable without pilots and buoys, and to the seamanship and courage of his captains and crews, was followed by the recall of Parker, and Nelson at once passed on to Revel, only to find that the Russian squadron had escaped. Meanwhile the Czar had died, and an amicable disposition prevailed upon all sides, which led to a treaty and the end of the northern confederacy against England. Six months later the preliminaries of peace were signed with France, though not before Nelson had experienced one of his rare failures in a boat attack upon Boulogne. This, however, was only an incident in an otherwise successful command in the Channel, during which he was able to satisfy the Government that the French menace of invasion was a mere feint. The conclusion of peace ended this command, and the victor of the Nile and Copenhagen was free to return to peace and the society of the Hamiltons.

The war of 1793-1801 left England the unchallenged mistress of the sea, with the one large fleet of her enemies closely imprisoned in Brest, and their remaining ships devoting their energies to the task of commerce-destroying—a policy which, Captain Mahan forcibly argues, may cause much loss and annoyance, but can never vitally affect the issue of a war. The outbreak of the new war in 1803 led to

XUM

Jan.

r to

nds test

ele-

yde

om-

ive,

t to

he

der-

the

her

use

past

to

ker

ren-

able

upsea-

wed

to

ped.

tion

end

iths

nce,

rare

was

the

ent

The

of

the

ged

nies

de-

g-

use

the

d to

a determined attempt on the part of Napoleon not so much to challenge the supremacy of England as to evade it. This effort took shape in the campaign which ended in Trafalgar. It was a struggle between Napoleon on one side and the English navy, of which the main centre of activity was in Nelson, on the other. It has not unfrequently been held that in this strategic contest Napoleon had the best of it, and that his success was practically assured when the faint-heartedness of his admiral, Villeneuve, threw the game finally into the hands of Nelson. To those who hold that belief a careful study of Captain Mahan and Professor Laughton may be recommended.

No one understood better than Napoleon the paralysing force which the English sea power could bring to bear on France in time of war, sweeping away, as he said, 'ships, colonies, and commerce.' The previous war had made it abundantly clear that the French fleet could not look the English in the face upon anything approaching equal terms. Therefore his only chance lay in bringing his overwhelming military force into play on land; and this could only be done by luring the English squadrons from the Channel for a sufficient time to allow of his throwing an invading army on the shores of England. It was to this enterprise that all his forces were bent when war broke out in May 1803. The first step was to assemble a great army at Boulogne, and to build a vast flotilla of boats for its transport. The details of this great undertaking, as well as those of St. Vincent's admirable organization of the defence, are intensely interesting; but for them we have no space. For two years of constant anxiety the English squadrons watched the ports, uncertain when or where the attempt would be made, but knowing that all depended upon their continuous vigilance. Various causes contributed to delay and alter Napoleon's plans, and it was not until the beginning of March 1805 that his final combination was made.

The central points of importance were Brest, Ferrol, and Toulon, at each of which a French squadron was blockaded by an English force. The Brest and Toulon squadrons were to slip out, release the French and Spanish ships in Ferrol, sail to the West Indies, and do what damage they could to the English possessions there, and then, when an English force had been drawn thither in pursuit, return to Boulogne and give Napoleon the few hours' command of the Channel which he required. That once secured, he did not doubt that he would soon be able to issue to an awe-struck world those

a

w 10

W

te

E

S

n

P

11

h

H

k

a

medals with the legend 'Frappé à Londres,' which he was

meanwhile having prepared.

Villeneuve at Toulon had already made one attempt to break out, but had been so roughly handled by the heavy weather that he was forced to return, while Nelson was looking for him on the road to Egypt. On April 4 he made a second start, with better success. While Nelson, still apprehensive about Egypt, watched the Mediterranean between Sardinia and the African coast, he slipped through the Straits of Gibraltar; and as Nelson, when authentic news of the enemy's movements reached him, was delayed by a succession of contrary winds, the French fleet gained a month's start in its flight to the West Indies. By a hot pursuit across the Atlantic Nelson gained twelve days; and when Villeneuve heard of his arrival he at once abandoned the hope of further conquests in the West Indies and started back for Europe. Nelson could not know for certain that he had done so; but he accurately calculated the probabilities and followed in pursuit, sending a frigate to warn the Admiralty. Meanwhile Ganteaume had entirely failed to break through Cornwallis's iron blockade of Brest, and Napoleon consequently sent orders to Villeneuve to steer for Ferrol, relieve the squadron there, and then, with thirty-five ships, descend upon Brest. Nelson, he hoped, was safe in the West Indies for a month at least, hunting for Villeneuve; and imagining the English Admiralty to be in an extreme state of panic, he pictured them to himself as despatching squadrons in every direction—to Ireland, to Egypt, to India—and so leaving the narrow seas at the mercy of his great combination.

In truth, Napoleon's elaborate schemes broke down before the steadiness of the English Admiralty,1 the tenacity of the blockading squadrons, and the rapidity of Nelson's pursuit and return. Villeneuve had time neither to make important conquests in the West Indies nor to wait for Ganteaume. Ganteaume, on his side, was unable to break out of Brest at Missiessy had broken out of Rochefort earlier in the year, about the time of Villeneuve's first attempt, but had found no fleet to unite with and returned to Rochefort, where he was promptly blockaded again. As Villeneuve with his twenty ships was nearing Ferrol on his return, his pursuer had already reached Gibraltar; the squadrons off Rochefort

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Captain Mahan assigns especial praise to the prompt and decisive measures taken by Lord Barham, the First Lord of the Admiralty, on receipt of the news, sent by Nelson, of Villeneuve's return to Europe (ii. 168, 169).

Jan.

was

t to

avy

king

ond

sive

inia

s of

the

sion

rt in

the

euve

ther

ope.

so;

d in

ean-

orn-

ntly

the

ipon

or a

, he

very

the

efore

the

rsuit

rtant

ume.

st at

the

had

here

n his

rsuer

efort

cisive

ty, on

urope

and Ferrol were united under Calder to meet him, and Cornwallis had twenty-five ships off Brest, which would have much to say before he could join hands with Ganteaume. Calder, with fifteen ships, meeting Villeneuve with twenty, failed to press the action home, and allowed him to join the force already But Nelson, bringing his squadron to strengthen Cornwallis off Brest, interposed a sufficient force to secure the command of the Channel, though numerically inferior to the total of the forces under Ganteaume and Villeneuve. The Emperor still hoped that the latter might have nerve to strike a blow for the release of the Brest fleet and the command of the narrow seas; but the sight of three ships of war as he put out from Ferrol inspired that admiral with visions of an impending British fleet, and he put back to Cadiz, where Collingwood was quickly watching him with twenty-six sail, while sixteen were sufficient to hold Ganteaume's twenty-one

safely bound in Brest.

Napoleon's combination had never been very near success, and now it had completely failed. So far as any immediate possibility of the invasion of England was concerned, Trafalgar need not have been fought. Napoleon had already transferred his army to the Austrian frontier, and was closing upon Ulm, when his continued taunts and threats drove Villeneuve out of Cadiz on a hopeless attempt to reach the Mediterranean. He had thirty-three ships of the line, and outside Nelson (who, after a short visit to England, had come out to take command) was waiting for him with twenty-seven. The result is well known as the most famous sea fight in history. In spite of its celebrity it is not so conspicuous a model of naval tactics as the battle of the Nile. Nelson's plan was based on the idea that, with so large a fleet as that under his command, it was better to attack in two lines than in one; and his intention was that one line should attack and destroy the enemy's rear by superior numbers, while the other delayed and kept off his centre and van. The plan was sound enough, and once more illustrated the supreme principle of being superior in force at the decisive point; but under the actual circumstances of the day it would hardly have been successful against a more efficient enemy than the allied French and Spanish fleets. The wind was so light that the leading ships of each column were for a long time under fire before reaching their enemy's line, and with good gunnery ought to have been completely crippled before they could make any reply. But Nelson knew French gunnery, and was willing to take a risk in order to force on a decisive battle; and the result was an overwhelming victory

B

th

st

aı

re

m

CI

SI

ai

th

ai

0

C

b

where a less vigorous commander would hardly have succeeded in effecting more than a distant cannonade. Collingwood, with the right or lee column, crushed the enemy's rear; Nelson, with the left column, crushed his centre and overawed his van, some of the ships of which never came into effective action at all. The end is well known. In the mêlée which followed the double breaking of the French line the British gunnery overwhelmed the allied ships one by one; but the Victory, after suffering considerably before she reached the French line, suffered still more from the musketry of her immediate opponent, the Redoutable, and Nelson himself fell, shot from her mizen-top through the shoulder and backbone. The victory was, however, complete. Eighteen vessels of the allies struck on the spot, four more were captured or wrecked during the next fortnight, and the remaining eleven, which escaped into

Cadiz, were never fit for service again.

The victory of Trafalgar and the death of Nelson close the dramatic period of the naval war against France. They do not, however, end the lessons which that war teaches; and we would gladly follow Captain Mahan in his most instructive sketch of the influence of England's naval power on the subsequent stages of the Napoleonic struggle. Unseen and often unnoticed by historians, it was the force which drove Napoleon to his ruin. He had failed in his direct blow at England; his only hope of ultimate success lay in cutting off her trade and so draining her strength. The French sailors devoted themselves to commerce-destroying; and the facts which Captain Mahan brings out in this connexion are extremely valuable. His conclusions are, in effect, two-first, that even when the naval supremacy of England was so established that no French squadron could put to sea, the loss from capture of merchant vessels was very great; but, secondly, that it is hopeless to think of affecting the ultimate result of a war by commercedestruction alone. Napoleon discovered this. His cruisers and privateers might capture hundreds of English vessels, but hundreds more escaped and carried on traffic with all the world, while meantime the commerce of France was extinct and her colonies a prey. To redress this one-sided conflict he formed a vast, a truly Napoleonic scheme-no less than the closing, by force or persuasion, of all the ports of Europe to English ships, and so destroying that trade on which England's strength depended. It was a great scheme, and it went near succeeding. Austria, Prussia, Spain, Italy, Holland were occupied or overawed by his armies, while Russia was for a time attracted to his side; and in 1810 and 1811 the distress

eeded
, with
elson,
s van,
on at
ed the
over, after
line,
oppon her
ictory

Jan.

truck g the d into se the ey do nd we uctive e suboften oleon 1; his e and themaptain uable. en the rench chant ess to nerceuisers ls, but ll the xtinct onflict than urope Eng-

t went

l were

for a

istress

in England from the interruption of trade was very severe. But the suffering was not all on one side; if it was bad in England it was much worse in France, and the other Continental nations groaned under the compulsion which forced them to deny themselves the necessaries of life in order that their great enemy might triumph over the one country which still resisted him. Russia finally proved the weak point in his armour; it was not dominated by the French armies, and it refused to enforce the blockade with the stringency required by Napoleon. It was to crush this recalcitrancy that Napoleon marched to Moscow in 1812; and with the failure of the Russian expedition the whole fabric of the Napoleonic empire crumbled about his ears.

The story of the years between Trafalgar and Waterloo, thus told by Captain Mahan, is one of absorbing interest; but space forbids us to dwell upon it at greater length. We part with reluctance from a book which tells, from an impartial and yet sympathetic point of view, the story of England's naval greatness. It is a story which has a vital interest for us to-day; and it is not the least of Captain Mahan's merits that he has done much to bring home to all thinking men, and through them to the whole nation, the absolute necessity of keeping our navy strong. We may not be men of war, but we are men proud of our country. We believe that she has yet a great work to do in the world; and we cannot but recognize that in maintaining the decisive superiority of our navy lies not only the sole guarantee of our national existence, but also the hope of doing effectively in the councils of nations that work which we believe God has given us to do.

## ART. X.—THE 'ECONOMIC REVIEW'—A REPLY TO PROFESSOR STANTON.

The Economic Review. Published Quarterly for the Oxford University Branch of the Christian Social Union. October 1895. Article VI. 'The Church Quarterly Review on the Christian Social Union.' By the Rev. Professor V. H. STANTON, M.A.

In the Article cited above from the Economic Review Professor Stanton, at the suggestion of the Editors, replies to our criticism of Socialism and the Christian Social Union, which appeared in July 1895. The reply is prompted—we are told with

sk

re

WO

CI

"is

co

or

Ch

rec

vis

en

the

nes

ent

ad

effo Ba

stre

stro

the

Loi Ne

for,

reg

cou

Uni

the

in t

min

God

mer

of 1

mer

bles

seco

less no a

supp

a courtesy that we fully appreciate—by the respect due to the Church Quarterly Review and 'the good service it has done in many ways for the Church.' We are glad in any case that 'a fresh opportunity for stating again the principles of the Social Union' has not been neglected, and if we return to the consideration of the subject in the light of that statement it is not from any desire of continuing an academic discussion; not only are the points at issue of vital importance, but silence seems incompatible with the respect due to the high character and attainments of one so distinguished and revered as Professor Stanton.

He, with the acuteness we should expect from his reputation and ability, perceives at once that the contention is between two fundamentally different conceptions of the office of the Church and the relation of the Gospel to this present world.

He quoted from the *Church Quarterly Review* the following passages as representative of the view we hold:

'They strive to mend the world, which is doomed to be destroyed.'  $^{1}$ 

The approval of this saying of General Gordon's marks the temper of mind to which the Professor is opposed.

'The spirit of the whole series' (of articles in the *Economic Review* which illustrate the principles and policy of the Christian Social Union) 'is unmistakable; it assumes throughout that the regeneration of *secular* society is the proper object of the Christian Church, and that the Church exists for that purpose.' <sup>2</sup>

In the very act of making such a stricture, says the Professor, we reveal our conception of the necessary relation of the Church to human society. He, on the other hand, would say that this secular regeneration is one among other objects of the Christian Church, and 'that it exists for this among other purposes.' We would be quite content to narrow the issues to this one point, if we were sure that we were using the terms 'object' and 'purpose' unequivocally. Our contention is that the secular regeneration of society is no object or purpose of the Church in the truest sense at all. Such regeneration appears to us to be an indirect result of the spiritual life, and an 'object' only in a subsidiary sense, as a  $\pi \acute{a} \rho \rho \rho \rho \nu$  in life. It is not an 'End in Itself' of the Church, nor an end subservient to the final end, and a means to its attainment; our complaint is in the main that even the most

<sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 322; Economic Review, p. 520.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 323; Economic Review, p. 520.

Jan.

o the

done

f the

o the

nt it

sion;

high

vered

puta-

on is

office

resent

owing

to be

marks

Social genera-

hurch,

e Pro-

ion of

would

bjects

among

ow the

using

r con-

object Such

of the

e, as a

Church, s to its

e most

0.

skilled advocates of the Christian Social Union apparently regard it as either one or the other, or both.

'The admission' (on the part of Canon Scott Holland that 'he would repudiate any attempt to revive the mediæval fallacy that the Church can understand and direct the social affairs of the State') 'is fatal to the Organic Ideal (set forth, for example, by Bishop Westcott) as an ideal of human society. Humanity, in fact, lost its organic cohesion when it rebelled against God. The systems of government that arise on the earth are fragmentary, incoherent; Christianity supplies them with a corrective, with a vision of the best -but the best is not here realizable-men are fallen; even when redeemed, they wait the redemption of the body; and to present the vision as a practical standard for actual working here on earth, to encourage the construction of a political and social community on the assumption that ideal men will be found for it, that the weaknesses of human nature will be obliterated, that self-love will be entirely merged in service, is to lure humanity on to profitless adventures. Ideal men are, indeed, never de trop. With all the efforts of the members of the Christian Social Union-as, e.g., Canon Barnett-to stimulate and encourage the growth of such; with the stress they lay on character (in which they do not yield to the strongest Individualists) we have the strongest sympathy. But even the ideal men of the Christian Social Union are ideal citizens of London Town, and the mistake of pressing on for the formation of New London Town, while the ideal men can at best be only prayed for, is calamitous. Nothing but the faith that New London will regenerate character by its institutions, open spaces, libraries, &c., could excuse it, and this, in fact, is the faith of the Christian Social Union.'1

'There are two environments—one evil, of the world, of Nature, the power of which is broken by the Holy Ghost; the other spiritual, in the Communion of Saints; with this, and with this alone, have the ministers of the Gospel any direct concern; they bring the gift of God to whosoever believeth—not acting through any secular environ—

ment, but in the Holy Ghost.'2

'As to the office of the Church, all Christians, whatever their state of life, live Christianly, or endeavour so to do; but the works of mercy that they, through the Spirit, undertake, and the social blessings that follow from bearing Christ into every function, are secondary, indirect, and in their positive, concrete realization worthless in God's sight. The most perfectly arranged human society has no abiding value in itself; but whatever passing value it may be supposed to have is irremediably lost when it is set before the will as either end or means.' <sup>3</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 331; Economic Review, pp. 520, 521. <sup>2</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 334; Economic Review, p. 521.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 335; Economic Review, p. 521. VOL, XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

The interpretation placed on these passages by Professor Stanton is contained in the *Economic Review*, p. 524.

'To the Christian, he (i.e. the writer in the Church Quarterly Review) plainly tells us, all actions and courses of action which may affect others, and the forms of society and of individual human relations which may result therefrom, are indifferent, except (as we suppose he would add) in so far as they may rest upon positive Divine commandment, conveyed by revelation or manifest Providential appointment. And even if we should in either of these ways find it divinely enjoined upon us in such and such cases, or in a particular calling, to consider the effects of actions and institutions upon other men, we are required to expend this labour of thought and study simply as slaves. Properly speaking, the effects are nothing to us, and we must turn away our eyes from them as soon and as completely as possible. They are not in themselves a ground in any sense for preferring one kind of conduct, one theory of life, or scheme of (socalled) social reform to another. All these alike are "in their concrete realization worthless." We must not seek any good in them, however completely we may regard it as subordinate to the highest good. We must find no pleasure or happiness in any comfort or moral improvement (except in so far as we are still "natural" or "carnal" men) which our fellow men may derive from them. "Whatever passing value" any one of these things may be supposed to have is immediately lost when it is set before us as either end or means.'

The final italics are Professor Stanton's, and we gather that he considers social reforms means to the highest end, subordinate to the highest good, in the sense that they tend to advance it or procure it.

The interpretation continues-

'Such a view of the principles of Christian conduct as we are examining could not exist apart from, and is, we see, in the present instance, connected with, a conception of the opposition between the secular and the religious, not simply as of two alien kinds of spirit, but as of two orders of things materially [sic] separated from one another. The business of the State, philanthropic efforts, if directed by economic knowledge, plans of social improvement, trade and industry, as also necessarily science, and art, and innocent and healthful amusements, belong to the secular order. They are in nature so foreign to that spiritual life which is fed and which has its home in the Church, that the principles of the latter sphere cannot be introduced into the other to rule, and animate, and purify it. There can be no such thing as the sanctification of the common life of men. The idea that the material may be made the channel of the spiritual, that the whole external order is, according to God's design, sacramental, seems not to have dawned upon the writer's mind. There are two environments: one good, of grace, provided in the Church -the Communion of Saints; the other "natural," of the world, in whice elem made Monand justing basis rease scrib mist accurate of the G

men

the e

1896

Chu Chri by the view (as, insir terio The God press so fa not 1 a thi in ar

and every conc. Stan which and these possi takin prove

bore a

fessor

arterly
h may
n relae supDivine
lential
find it
ticular
n other
study
to us,

Jan.

pletely
nse for
of (soir conit them,
highest
afort or
ral" or
them.
apposed
end or

gather st end, y tend

we are present veen the f spirit, om one directed ade and ent and y are in e cannot ourify it. mon life el of the s design, . There Church

world, in

which the Christian can find nothing which he may reckon good, no elements with which Christianity may claim alliance, and which may be made to contribute to the same end as the ministrations of the Church Morality, except so far as it is expressly accepted from Revelation, and practised in conscious dependence upon grace, can only be justified, so far as it is capable of justification at all, on a materialistic basis. Patriotism and all the virtues of the citizen, and by equal reason every other duty which morality (apart from religion) prescribes, having to do with this life, are of the earth, earthy. It is a mistake to suppose that any of the aims and motives which we are accustomed to call high and noble make, any more than others which are of a different character, for the realization of the proper ends of the Gospel, that they have their place in God's counsels as instruments in the salvation finally of human beings, and in working out the establishment of His kingdom.' 1

Professor Stanton asserts that in some former ages of the Church 'a vast number and even the great majority of earnest Christians held these opinions;' that 'those deeply influenced by the Evangelical movement were infected with the same view;' and that when not pushed to its logical consequence (as, e.g., by St. Simeon Stylites) it has led to a peculiar form of insincerity, and has probably been to a certain extent 'deleterious.' He considers it also to be a practical Manicheism. The unfortunate victims of this delusion do indeed acknowledge God the creator and make the Fall responsible for the world's present hopeless condition. 'But that can make no difference, so far as our own conduct is concerned, if it (the world) cannot be redeemed, or if any redemption that awaits it is wholly a thing of the future, in bringing about which we are not able in any way to bear a part by our action now.' <sup>2</sup>

I. We observe that whereas we said that 'works of mercy, and social blessings that follow from bearing Christ into every function, are secondary, indirect, and in their positive concrete realization worthless in God's sight,' Professor Stanton substitutes for these, 'actions and courses of action which may affect others, together with the forms of society, and of individual human relations;' affirms that we call all these 'indifferent;' that in consequence we have no morality possible but that of slavish obedience, and are precluded from taking any spiritual pleasure in the comfort or moral improvement of our fellow-men. With one sweep of the pen,

1 Economic Review, p. 525.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 526. It might be pertinent to ask whether St. Paul, e.g., bore any part in the 'redemption of the world' in Professor Stanton's sense, or whether we refuse to bear any part in it in St. Paul's.

i.e., the Professor has confounded the moral activities with what Dr. Pusey called the 'body of those activities,' virtue with the body of virtue, sin with the body of sin, and while we specially qualified the worthlessness even of that body the Professor has removed the qualification.

All that we affirm is that the secular effects of our actions, apart from the intention that produces them and the soul that animates them, are morally nil; they pass away.

They are things of the world.

'Only the actions of the just Smell sweet and blossom in the dust.'

2. We are credited with conceiving of the 'secular and religious' as of two spirits, two orders of things, 'materially' separated from one another. The secular is, i.e., 'so foreign to that spiritual life, &c., that the principles of the latter cannot be introduced into the other to rule and animate and purify it; there can be no such thing as the sanctification of the common life of man.' A moment's reflection must have convinced the Professor that a writer who spoke of 'social blessings flowing from Christian men who bear Christ into every function,' and of the Church 'fostering and creating civilization,' held no such theory as he credits us with. Blessings cannot flow without a channel, nor make their way through material barriers. The sacramental character of secular institutions is too ambiguous a subject for profitable discussion here.

The Professor has given, in fact, approximately an account of a disease that has at various times afflicted Christian souls. An analysis of it which is, perhaps, more delicate and true, and which raises fewer knots of inquiry, will be found in Newman's Parochial and Plain Sermons, vol. iii. Sermon XI. (Longmans, 1891). The only ground we have given for attributing it to us is the brief sentence, There are two environments—one evil—of the world, of Nature, the power of which is broken by the Holy Ghost.'1 We have no desire to abandon the teaching of our infancy that we are by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, and by the mission of grace at enmity with the world we renounce.' Nevertheless theology teaches us to discriminate between a world which is conditionally good and a world which is evil. The world which is conditionally good is the world of God's making, appointing, and preserving, which, whether we regard it as Nature, or as the kosmos of hap evil and envirect which

1896

Chu to b and

God

deriv

to a

it m ende ditio Hun hum is at impe enter vary socie activ trans glear is in ditio betw creat mere that : With

begin there tians, Chris mere arran of litti is the lican repub

shall

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 334.

while body r ac-d the away.

with

r and rially' oreign latter le and ion of thave social at into eating with. ir way ter of fitable

ly an fflicted more nquiry, ermons, und we ntence, orld, of host.' infancy lren of e world to disood and ly good serving, smos of social order, has still in it much that contributes to pleasure, happiness, the better ordering of life. The world which is evil is the same kosmos spoiled by man, which presses on, and entangles, and tempts the human soul; this is the environment in which every Christian life lived creates indirectly a change for the better. This is the evil environment which the Social Union considers a proper object of the Church to attack, its redemption one of the purposes for which the Church exists; while the conditionally good environment is to be sought both for its own sake as a desirable end in itself, and also as a means of saving and sanctifying human souls.

But although this conditionally good environment is of God, and pleasure and happiness, nay, even help may be derived from it so far as it exists, or hoped from it so far as it may possibly exist, it is for many reasons no object of endeavour or trust to Christians. In the first place, the conditions are such that it neither is nor can be realized. Human nature is the chief ingredient in its composition, and human nature, without adopting the ultra-Calvinist formula, is at least so far fallen from original righteousness that its imperfections must taint every combination into which it enters. Even in the regenerate the corruption remains in varying degree, but the forms and institutions of human society are far from being the embodiment of regenerate activities. Again, even if realizable, it is by the conditions transitory. Not only are 'the golden ages' fugitive, passing gleams of sunshine on the earth, but the earth and all that is in it are doomed to destruction. Yet again, in the conditionally good environment distinction must be made between the concrete forms and the human qualities that create them; and further among these between those that are mere moralities and those that are of grace. It is these last that alone give any effective power or vitality to the others. Withdraw the grace, and the concrete body it has taken begins to putrefy; it is the grace, not the environment, therefore, that is the object of endeavour and trust to Christians, and from this very point of view the concentration of Christian desire on secular environment is a mistake. Finally, mere concrete forms of government, institutions, social arrangements, are even by political wisdom pronounced to be of little value for securing even well-being or happiness, which is the secular end. Grace is of grace alone. If, e.g., republican institutions have not availed to create in France a true republic, but a bureaucratic centralized officialism only, how shall it be expected that public enactment can avail in a

Sur

WOI

on infa

in i

has

the

ma

sav

Chi

true

the

imp The

as e

tion

hor of t

ten

as a

ma

par

to

upo

not

nes bui

nes

wor

Go

cre

'do

a l

doc

ing

tha

of 7

sphere of life far more difficult to reach and influence than mere political habits? The secular order has on it, in fact, all the stamps of vanity and impotence. 'Love not, therefore, the world nor the things that are in it,' whatever of passing value they may have.

But as a matter of fact the actual environment is in most ages, in most places, for most men, evil. Enmity with the world is the condition of the Christian's pilgrimage. Often severance, renunciation, flight seems the very call of God Himself. On the one hand the entanglements of cares, of schemings, of anxieties, may seem too real a danger to be fought with, rather to be fled. On the other hand, all the avenues by which grace might influence the world may appear so closed that abandonment may be judged the paramount duty.

That the kosmos of civilized order has at various epochs in Church history presented itself in such an aspect to the majority of contemporary Christians is true, but charges of practical Manicheism, or Neo-Platonism, are not substantiated by the facts. The charge has not only been brought against the monastic system. Men of the calibre of Mr. John Morley have ascribed to the same 'metaphysical idea, the first reestablishment of the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ.'

The renunciation of the world may be parodied, and has been parodied, but only in ages where such renunciation is a wide-spread fact, not in ages like our own, in which it is a rare phenomenon.<sup>2</sup>

Nor have the men who abandoned the world as an 'object' done the least for it. They have 'fostered and created and healed civilization.'

For example, Wilberforce's Practical View has probably in its day been as effective in that regard as any single work that could be cited, and it sprang from that very Evangelical school which Professor Stanton declares to have been infected by the Manichean strain of thought. Yet the indirect effects of a revived Christianity on morality, patriotism, secular government are therein in many forcible pages 3 set before politicians as the express ground that 'it has pleased the

<sup>1</sup> Morley, Voltaire, pp. 269, &c., Eversley Series.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For this reason the disease was found very commonly among the Evangelicals, but we believe that Newman was more just in his estimate than the Professor. Deleterious insincerity is not so much the effect of relinquishing the evil world, or of conceiving the idea of a duty to relinquish it, as it is the root of a fraudulent self-deceiving spiritualism such as the preacher in St. Mary's pulpit sketched in imperishable outline.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. chap. vi.

ce than in fact, t, thereever of

lan.

on most with the Often of God ares, of r to be all the appear amount

epochs to the orges of antiated against Morley first ret.' 1 and has ation is

h it is a
l as an
red and

robably de work ingelical infected indirect m, secut before ised the

nong the estimate effect of ity to re-iritualism e outline.

Supreme Governor so to order the social arrangements of the world' that 'looking to Jesus' only, in the Evangelic sense, on the part of any considerable number of citizens must infallibly strengthen and purify the secular order. What else, in fact, is the so-called 'political use' of Christianity which has enlisted on its behalf as an institution the support of those who have rejected it as a faith? But Wilberforce puts these considerations before politicians only, as a secondary matter, with many apologies, not as of any avail for the saving of souls.\(^1\)

Justin Martyr in his Apology urges on the Emperor that Christianity makes good citizens, which is partly true. Is it true that the preachers of Christianity looked for one moment at the making of good citizens for the Roman Empire? Did they regard it as either end or means? Did they hope by improving the secular environment to win souls for Christ? There came an age which laboured for secular results both as end and means. Did it achieve the success in that direction achieved by their predecessors who had no thought, no hopes, no fears apart from the Heavenly City and the Advent of the Lord, who never turned aside for one moment to contemplate secular success or to trust in secular improvements, as a means of 'hastening the kingdom'?

The Benedictine monks—that we may turn again to a masterpiece of Newman's 2-went out from the world; they parted with all its entanglements, all its far-reaching schemes, to live from day to day, cultivating holiness, fixing their eyes upon the eternal. Did they bless or curse the world? Did they not dig and drain, plough and garden, create out of wildernesses pleasant social environments full of every human grace, build, and teach, and heal? Had they no pleasure and no happiness in the works of their hands? And was not their secular work in its positive concrete realization worthless, worthless in their eyes compared with the Eternal Home, worthless in God's eyes compared with the pure souls that animated and created the passing environment, that at its best was temporal, 'doomed to be destroyed,' full of imperfections, but when once a habit of religiosity and secular attachments had entered, doomed also to a loathsome corruption.

Happiness is the secular ideal that sums up all the longings of the world. Is it any new or strange moral teaching that happiness is found of them who seek it not? So also he

2 'Mission of St. Benedict,' Historical Sketches.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Wilberforce, *Practical View*, p. 222, Ancient and Modern Library of Theology.

that would bring happiness to mankind, must have set his heart on bringing them not happiness but bliss, and the peace of God, which, passing understanding, is compassed by no human endeavour.

That the 'world' is now in such a condition that its entire abandonment ought to be preached we have not urged.1 it be that there are hopes and possibilities of the environment of the Stock Exchange, e.g., or the factory, or the shop, being adjusted to the necessities of a Christian existence. Every Christian where he is as merchant, as peasant, as squire, or as king is under the obligation of living Christianly where he is. If his worldly calling oblige him to consider far-reaching schemes of reform, there is his duty; let him do it; and having before him a definite secular end, devote himself to the study of divers utilities. We find no fault with Mr. Balfour for weighing the effects of Bimetallism, or with Lord Salisbury for giving anxious days and nights to the reform of Turkey, or with Parliament for spending months on the consideration of Employers' Liability. They have to do it, and in the necessity there lies a spiritual danger, which is not thrust upon the ministers of Christ.

'Very difficult is the work that is thrust on the layman, to steer between two evils—to use this world as not abusing it, to be active and diligent in the world's affairs, yet not for the world's sake but for God's sake. It requires the greater effort for a minister of Christ to speak of it, for this reason, because he is not called on in the same sense in which others are to practise this duty. He is not called, as his people are, to the professions, pursuits, and cares of this world. His work is heavenly, and to it he gives himself wholly. We are tried by the command to live out of the world, and you, laymen, by the command to live in it.' <sup>2</sup>

In this sense we said,<sup>3</sup> 'With the spiritual environment alone have the ministers of Christ any direct concern.'

So far, then, as the Christian Social Union is encouraging Christian ministers to occupy their time with secular utilities, it se in th griev will gave Cult brius legis mos

1896

effor not be re may all ti ness gres

cond

e.g.,

so it Him now from diffe by o the tion. gern Gosj

envi:

socia happ ness: the n sturd vigou weak have been

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. however, Dr. Wace, Christianity and Agnosticism, p. 288, reprinted from the Quarterly Review, October 1888. 'The time seems to have come when people who wish to live Christian lives and to maintain Christian thoughts must hold themselves aloof from a society in which, as Mrs. Ward says, "everything is an open question, and all confessions of faith are more or less bad taste." Life at the Universities for young men, life in ordinary society for young women, seems fast becoming, under the influence of an unscrupulous philosophy and literature, too mischievous, or too dangerous to be encountered without necessity. The Christian world will have to draw a fence round itself,' &c.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Newman, Parochial and Plain Sermons, viii. 170.

<sup>3</sup> Church Quarterly Review, p. 334.

Jan.

his

eace

ntire •

Let

ment

eing

very

e, or

re he

hing

and

nself

Mr.

Lord

m of

con-

and

not

steer active it seems to us to be setting them in a wrong direction, and, in the best interests of secularity itself, to be perpetrating a grievous mistake. Anything they may achieve in that line will be 'in its positive concrete realization worthless.' We gave as an instance a 'perfectly arranged human society.' Culture, grace, refinement, a well-balanced economic equilibrium, a scientific control of the whole of life, and a perfect legislative equipment, a high standard of morality on the most approved utilitarian basis, golden rulers-such a state, e.g., as Professor Huxley sketched for the goal of human effort—there would you have 'a positive concrete realization,' not for a moment to be a Christian end, not for a moment to be regarded as a helpful arena or garden in which holiness may be sheltered and grown.

The cry that has been growing louder and louder through all this century has been for 'not bliss, but happiness; not holiness, but bread; not in heaven, but here and now!' 'Progressive Christian ethics' has been busy accommodating its conception of the kingdom of God to that cry, and in doing so it seems to us to have departed from the standpoint of Him who preached, indeed, a kingdom of heaven 'here and now' 'realized and realizable,' but one altogether distinct from any earthly Utopia. We are asked to believe that different methods, different preachings would have been used by our Lord had He ministered in the nineteenth century; the difference appears to us to amount to a change of direction. It is said, we know, that it is merely development from germ, involving no breach of continuity. But we prefer the Gospel and the methods first delivered and first used, think them sufficient for all ages, and augur no good from the composite Rousseau Christ.

But Professor Stanton reminds us that the new social environment is sought for for the sake of its influence on character, as a means for the salvation of souls, and here we

must allow him to speak for himself.

e but Christ same ed, as vorld. e are n, by ment

iging lities,

8, re-

ms to

mainety in l cones for ming, e, too

<sup>&#</sup>x27;That too much trust may be put in the moral effects of external social arrangements and laws, every Christian will admit. And it is happily true that characters of great nobleness and purity and saintliness may sometimes be met with, and even reared, amidst surroundings the most unpromising. But in the 'environment' where a peculiarly sturdy moral and spiritual shoot may survive, or even attain to greater vigour through the difficulties which it has to overcome, many a weaker one may be killed off, which might have lived, and even have attained to a high degree of excellence, if circumstances had been more propitious to it. And assuredly it cannot be said that

wis

sur

kil

fav

fan

in

mi

pa

occ

ha

eds

sin W

tua

me

tru

and

hal wa

the

say

we

wa

mu

ou

pri

una kill

cui

litt

but

the

but

dea

that

doi

overcrowded dwellings, irregularity of employment, and either penury on the one hand or great wealth on the other, especially if the latter be unaccompanied by very definite, large, and generally recognized responsibilities, are favourable to morality and godliness in the case of average men and women. And, if so, those who have the true welfare of men at heart cannot afford to neglect the political, social, and economic conditions under which they live. Christians, as a body, have too little realized the nature of the influence of these things, though in this they have probably not been behind the great majority of mankind. This lesson of human experience has been slowly gathered, and in order that it may be duly appreciated, a not inconsiderable amount of intellectual training, and that moreover of a peculiar kind, would seem to be required.' 1

We wonder what this new study is, 'requiring intellectual training of a peculiar kind,' the fruits of which are so extraordinary. Here is the true welfare of men at stake, and it depends on considerations to which neither our Lord Himself nor the first preachers of the Gospel condescended to give the slightest attention, and the importance of which 'Christians as a body have realized rather less than the great majority of mankind.' We gather that this study has to do with the effect of heredity, environment, circumstances, on But how that can be called new which has occupied philosophical speculation for at least three thousand years we are unable to conceive. We have heard, indeed, that the hypotheses of Darwin separate with an impassable chasm the intellectual life of our own day from that of the first half of the century; and it is in a sense true. Evolution, with its consequences, occupies the field; multitudinous facts are accumulated; all men are familiarized with thoughts that once were the possession of a few; a vast mass of literature, saturated with mechanical principles, has flooded the world; the principles of mechanism have become popular and domi-But the conditions of the problem to be solved remain the same. The logical consequences and perplexities of mechanism, and the difficulties of reconciling it with responsibility, had not to wait for any 'progressive Christian ethics' to give them lucid exposition, and have not received from those studies any new illumination. The voices of that mechanical theory of the formation of character which has been and is one of the deadliest enemies of the Christian Church are clear: 'We are what heredity and circumstances together make us; 'We are machines, automata, with a limited power of selfadjustment.' Compare them with Professor Stanton's practical

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Economic Review, p. 522.

penury
e latter
ognized
ne case
ue welal, and
y, have
ough in
f manthered,
derable
r kind,

tellecare so stake. Lord ended which great to do es, on h has ousand ndeed. ssable of the lution. s facts ts that rature, world; domiremain ies of

ponsi-

ics' to

those

is one

: 'We

e us;

of self-

actical

but of kind.1

wisdom: 'Saints may sometimes be met with in unpromising surroundings,' but 'weaker spiritual shoots are sometimes killed;' 'assuredly extreme poverty and wealth are not favourable to morality and godliness in average men.' We are familiar enough with language of this kind; it is the stock in trade of fin de siècle moralizing. But will God allow His ministers to use it, and will intellectual training find it compatible with distinctive Christian principles? Shall we have occasion still to use this proverb in Israel, that 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge'? Shall the soul that sinneth die, and die because it sinneth, but sin because of its 'unfavourable surroundings'? What else can the Professor mean when he speaks of 'spiritual shoots being killed,' and of 'godliness,' which is one of the seven spirits that are about the throne, being at the mercy of a man's income? We put aside the question of truth as to facts. We believe, indeed, that in all ages saints and martyrs have been most numerous in those very classes which Professor Stanton holds to be their most unlikely The very rich have listened to their Saviour's warnings, and the very poor have hearkened to the Gospel of their heritage. Let us put, however, facts aside. Are we not obliged, whatever the facts may be, by our mission to say to every soul, everywhere, in all circumstances, that to sin is to die, and to die by God's just judgment? If so, shall we say to it in the same breath, and of it to its neighbour, that 'unfavourable surroundings' killed it, because naturally it was not very strong?

Professor Stanton has, however, two saving clauses—'Too much trust may be put in the moral effects of external social arrangements,' and 'We must beware of ever losing sight of our distinctive Christian principles.' But distinctive Christian principles are incompatible with 'mechanism,' and it is pure unadulterated mechanism to talk of spiritual shoots being killed which might have survived under more propitious circumstances. Nor is this a case in which 'too much' or 'too little' can have any application; it is not a question of degree,

¹ Professor Stanton has himself repudiated the solution we offered; the social reforms in their concrete realization may be indifferent enough, but the Holy Spirit, working in the souls of men that bring them in pity, may touch and revivify the spirit of the dying, and rouse to life again the dead. The social reforms are, in a word, the mere body of a spiritual activity. That is the one element in all this Christian Social movement that seems to us vital with a true vitality; we have been accused of not doing justice to certain men j it would seem to us impertinent and un-

tha

pa

Ch

ma

to

Ca

V V

it i

is

Pa

in

're

be

Ec

an

tha

on

ath

los

So

the

SOI

wi

Uı

life

So

CO

Bu

eve

lit

ch

S

ab

shi

ca

ma

in

wr

are

th

ce

no

The influence of habit, of surroundings, on character reaches far in many directions, but not to the one thing needful; they can, in the sphere of holiness, determine the body and line of its development, and in the sphere of vice its form, but they have absolutely no power to make a man virtuous or vicious. They may clothe the respectable with the garb of religiosity, they may build up for practical civic purposes a very serviceable imitation of 'courage,' e.g., and other civic excellencies. They can clothe the coarse with a vesture of society manners; they can hide a true spirit under a hideous mask of class vulgarities which are often stamped as sins; they can blind the eyes to distinctions which ought to be observed; they can shut men up in an ignorance which in ignorance sins, and for its ignorance is forgiven, but which clings with unspeakable fidelity to whatever good it knows.

Wide is the field that is here opened to the activity of the Church, although even thus it remains doubtful whether social reforms are the proper means and vehicle of its energy.

But behind the problems of habit and circumstance lies the deeper problem of heredity. Does heredity determine the ability to live or the necessity to die of 'spiritual shoots'? Certainly, whatever bondage of this sort there may be in Nature, our gospel is that in Christ all are free; nor does the Catholic religion allow us to believe or say that heredity, any more than habit or circumstance, determines the slaying or

making alive again of individual souls.

The mechanical theory of things has its modern strength in the great accumulation of facts, and in the growth of the conviction that for every state of nature, society, man, there is a cause in nature. Against it we Christians have to set a Faith the philosophical justification of which is, and may remain, incomplete, a Faith that an all-seeing Providence puts every one of us where we are to bring forth fruit; what He requires of us there, in the slum or the palace as in the middle-class house or the comfortable cottage, we are able by His grace, if we will receive it, to perform. This is our message. If the language of mechanism is current on every lip in these days, all the more for that very reason should the very suspicion of it be banished from our own, and we regret seemly to say of this one or the other what we thought as to their saint-We were dealing with opinions, preachings, and with liness or motives. a definite collection of these, not with men's characters. We believe that we see right in this matter, and some of them, so far as we understand, see wrong; but we would willingly exchange our orthodoxy, if it is such, for their heterodoxy, if it is so, as they tive it. But the heterodoxy they have established will be here when they are gone. thing the the vice man

Jan.

h the civic , and ith a under mped ought which

which ows. of the social

e lies ne the ots'? be in es the v, any ng or

ength
of the
there
to set
I may
e puts
at He
nn the
ble by
is our
every
ld the
regret
r saintnd with

r saintnd with
eve that
erstand,
is such,
xy they

that encouragement should be given by any Christian voices to the new fatalism.

But when we come to the definite reforms for the most part advocated, we find ourselves in a further conflict with the Christian Social Union. We will not repeat the charges we made against Socialism. They have, in fact, been admitted to be true. If we said that Socialism was a vague term, Canon Scott Holland immediately glories in its vagueness, for 'vagueness is strength.' If we said that Socialism was wicked. it is immediately allowed that Continental Socialism, forsooth, is so, but not our native product, as though Battersea were in Paris, and the Social Democratic Federation had no branches in London. Professor Stanton finds fault with the phrase 'reduced to iniquity,' as applied to Socialism; it is, we believe, due to the Duke of Argyll, and we found it in the Economic Review. Is Socialism wicked? the Professor asks: and, if so, why? Perhaps the simplest answer that occurs is that it pleads guilty to the indictment and laughs at it. The only effective Socialism we know is frankly materialist, openly atheistic, and boasts that it inherits the opinions of the philosophers of the Revolution on sexual impurity. Between Socialism such as this and the socialism of innocent emotion there are so many varieties, some of which are wicked and some virtuous, that we cannot pretend to be even acquainted with them all. Vagueness is indeed strength. But the Social Union, we believe, draws the line at the sanctity of family life. Every scheme, it admits, that touches that is wicked. Socialism, as recognized by the Christian Social Union, is, in contrast to this, now asserted to be a purely economic proposal. But Bishop Westcott, in his definition, expressly excluded even economic arrangements and financial schemes. It is a little difficult to fasten any character, good or bad, upon so chameleontic a creature as this. Professor Stanton uses 'Socialism' in its ordinary sense as a scheme of things which abolishes private property and substitutes for it State owner-This, he says, men of mature study and reflection may call foolish, but not wicked. We called it wicked for two main reasons. First, because, however desirable or innocent in itself, there are no possible means of attaining it without wrong. It will be very strange, replies the Professor, if there are no righteous means of realizing a righteous result. Yet there are many men at this moment whose desires are innocent, but not to be realized without theft. Secondly, we do not find in Socialism itself any possibility of virtue, for it seems to us to necessarily involve such repression of individual

liberty that virtue, which implies freedom, would be replaced by the 'excellencies' of animals. But, says Professor Stanton, we have never tried it, and so cannot tell. It may, e.g., be favourable to liberty. In that case we should say it was wicked to agitate for the introduction of a system the effects of which cannot be calculated. But on every ground that we can call reasonable, on the ground of the ideal sketched by the great master, and on the nature of things by which economic relations rule or are ruled by all others, and on the ground of the tentative experiments already made, we should believe that severe systematic compulsion, the minute regulation of all life, and a free use of infanticide, or some even more revolting means of checking population, were essential and necessary elements in a Socialist state.

The late Master of Balliol (Dr. Jowett) used to say in his airy way that Socialism was strange to us, but that in the course of ages some 'poet' might arise and convince us that private property was wicked, and 'that in some distant age or clime, and through the influence of some individual, the notion of common property may or might have sunk as deep into the heart of a race, and have become as fixed to them, as private property is to ourselves.' It is a dangerous principle to apply to morality, and one whose fruits are beginning to show themselves in novels and dramas which play

tricks with our most cherished moral convictions.

One of the many impotencies of reason is its incapacity to lay down any single principle of government which does not lead either to anarchy or despotism as its logical result. Decision depends upon a practical  $a i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma i s$ , or 'tact,' and this will vary with circumstances. The repugnance to and rebellion against Socialist measures are largely caused by the fact that practical reforms, so called, are being advocated not on their own practical merits, but as part and parcel of a great 'poetic' propaganda. If any proposal for the common good is stamped upon at once as 'Socialist,' this is largely due to the policy of Professor Stanton's friends, who have not taken the pains definitely to sever themselves from the 'poetic' movement, but rather identify themselves with the doctrine of instalments and prophesy of ideal reformation as their final goal.

But while any discussion of the limits of State interference is impossible, or at least fruitless, in the secular field, till some agreement on first principles is come to (e.g. Socialism is basing a claim for State regimentation upon à priori individual natural rights, while Individualists are supporting Indi-

poli poli to w sista of the dual faith If, h ever ther

1896

once fresh disc Bles exp Chu the mitt grov out

> ciate teac affor clair disp

the reference this critical was Why our so not is or of the control of the critical was a second control of the critical w

false

were

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Jowett, Introduction to the Republic of Plato, p. clxxvii.

placed anton, g., be t was seffects at we ed by which ad on made, n, the de, or , were

in his in the s that age al, the ank as ked to gerous are be-

city to
es not
Denis will
bellion
et that
n their
boetic'
amped
licy of
pains
ement,
lments

erence l some lism is indivi-Individualism on the ground of social utility), while, we say, secularly this impotence exists, for Christians no ideal secular polity is revealed as proper to pursue; but they have a spiritual polity of their own, to which they are bound, and in obedience to which they must ultimately adopt an attitude of passive resistance to any secular Socialism. For the polity of Christians of the Church starts from the individual as the unit; individual self-consciousness, individual responsibility, individual faith, individual love are the ultimate constitutive elements. If, however, you withdraw from individual control, and consent, everything that belongs to economic relations, you withdraw therefrom practically the whole of secular life.

The extent of the change so brought about is visible at once if we turn to the pages of the New Testament. There, fresh essays in Pseudokenotism will be needed, and we shall discover still other things besides 'literary details' which our Blessed Lord either did not know or did not condescend to explain. We have already heard that He committed the Church to views of the Old Testament which will not stand the light of criticism; we shall have to hear that He committed her to principles of morality which the world has outgrown, and to methods of propagating the Gospel that are

out of date.

We regret, finally, to have seemed not 'justly to appreciate' the men whom we criticized, their aims, and their teaching. We took into our view no other data than those afforded by the volumes at the head of our Article. Their claims to be fairly representative appear to us to be beyond dispute, and we only hope not to have misrepresented them.

As for want of respect for intellectual greatness, two of the names mentioned by Professor Stanton were so slightly referred to by us that they ought not to have been quoted in this context. Of Bishop Westcott the third, the whole of the criticism is based on a quotation from Professor Flint; neither was there in it anything at which just offence could be taken. Why should we pay a false reverence to men who have been our masters and teachers, and to whom we are indebted for so much as we are to Bishop Westcott? A public utterance is one for public comment, and if criticism meant depreciation of the great, or a high estimation of self, and if in every art it were not understood how much easier it is to see the occasional false stroke than to make one true one, criticism would die.

Bishop Westcott is one from whom no one would rashly differ on any subject that came within the province of his

IT

set

im

sup

tiv

sch

Th

Vo

the

inte

tak

by

con

hav

pre

Boa

sup

is t

'Th

shou

is t

or a

forn

opin

child

thin

circu

one

unal

natio exen object majo give

learning; but Bishop Westcott himself has always appeared to us, as to many others, to be liable to that obscurity which comes from a mystic vision. The identities of the local with the infinite, of the temporal with the eternal, of the material with the spiritual are ever before him. This mystic intuition and blending of things in the heaven with things in the earth enables a spiritual soul to dwell happily and profitably among ideals, but it constitutes a danger when the mystic identities are taken for matter of fact, and troops of unmystical followers 'lay hold on the Idea in the Heavens' and drag

it down to the market-place.

Vague, nebulous, emotional were terms that we borrowed and used of a school of thought. There are intellectual giants whose forte it is to be vague; there are others whose most brilliant gift is nebulosity, and emotion is the first requisite of the revolutionary 'poet.' As applied to a school of thought they are doubtless terms of disparagement, although some at least of the members of the social union exult in their vagueness as Samson exulted in his hair. Nothing would give us more pleasure, however, than to acknowledge that the terms were unjustified; but we have seen from more quarters than onefrom men in authority, from rulers of the Church—the same request for more precision of thought, clearer dividing lines, more rational and explicit guidance, and we have lately noticed that the Social Union itself and its leaders have been somewhat busy with lectures and discussions on the very points we have referred to.

Meanwhile Professor Stanton's statement of policy is neither nebulous nor emotional; we regret that we gather from it, however, no clear conception of what that policy is. At any rate we prefer to believe that the clear conception it appears to us to contain is one that the Professor himself would repudiate. What other he would substitute we confess we are ignorant, so many are the alternatives that progressive

Christian ethics supply.

Distinctive Christian principles, the dogmas, the sacraments, devoted spiritual men, we are reminded, remain as a rock of security; these are the bulwark against any chance of heresy. It is well.

But, as the Professor will remember, these bulwarks were not always considered sufficient by our predecessors.

XUM

## ART. XI.—THE EDUCATIONAL CRISIS—A CONTINUATION.

 Proceedings of the London School Board. Published by the Church Education and Voluntary Schools Defence Union. (London, 1895.)

2. The Guardian. (London, 1895.)

3. The School Guardian. (London, 1895.)

It is almost unnecessary to say that until Parliament has settled what shall be done to redeem the promises made by important members of the present Government and many supporters of theirs during the recent General Election relative to the present strain upon the supporters of Voluntary schools, there can be no hope of cessation from the strife. Those who were warmly opposed to any concession to the Voluntary schools when the question was prominently before the country, at the time of the election, seem now to be rushing into print on the subject, as though they had not previously

taken sides on the question.

As a preliminary to the attack upon the Bill prepared by the National Society to carry out the resolutions of the committee appointed by the two Archbishops, it seems to have been thought expedient to seek to excite a popular prejudice against Mr. Athelstan Riley. The London School Board has the following rule, which seems to mark its supreme indifference for the kind of religious teaching which is to be given in the schools for which it is responsible: 'The religious opinions of candidates (for teacherships) should not in any way influence their appointment.' is to say, a Christian believer or an infidel, a Churchman or an Agnostic, a Roman Catholic or a Parsee, a Nonconformist or a Hindoo, a Socinian or a Mormon, is in the opinion of the Board equally competent to teach religion to children in London Board schools. To amend this state of things the majority on the last School Board drew up the circular about which so much fuss was made at the time; one provision of which was that any teacher feeling himself unable to give religious teaching upon the broad, undenominational Christian lines laid down in the circular should be exempted from giving religious instruction upon stating his objection to the Board. In response to this circular a majority of the teachers replied that they would continue to give instruction according to the directions of the Board, VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

Jan peared which al with aterial tuition in the ofitably mystic inmys-

rrowed I giants se most equisite thought some at gueness is more ms were n one— he same, e lately we been

olicy is e gather policy is. eption it himself e confess ogressive e sacra-

he very

e sacranain as a y chance

rks were

S

Si

th

D

th

B

C

he

hi

th sig

of

m

he

res

an au

bo

bo

Ch

in

in

me

pai

be

which would only be in accordance with their previous practice; but a difficulty arose through the action of a number of teachers, who, influenced by Messrs. Macnamara and Gautrey, of the National Union of Teachers and the Metropolitan Board Teachers' Association (and members of the School Board), banded themselves with the Progressive party (who had strenuously opposed the circular) to make the circular and the amended rule unworkable, and then refused to answer a communication from the Board. Mr. Gautrey issued a printed letter to the teachers urging that 'to teach the doctrines of the circular would impart a sectarian bias to the instruction,' and that the right he claimed for all teachers, whatever their religious opinions, to give the religious instruction must be protected. Some of the teachers under the influence of himself and Mr. Macnamara thereupon signed a document issued by the Metropolitan Board Teachers' Association, which stated that the signatories were unable to teach under the circular, and therefore asked to be relieved of the duty. On the Board's addressing a letter to each of them, inquiring whether the refusal was on conscientious grounds in accordance with the terms of the circular, whilst 200 or 300 replied, the remainder, in a manifesto dated July 11, 1894, and issued on their behalf by the Metropolitan Board Teachers' Association, respectfully decided not to reply individually to the Board's individual request, and after advancing their opinion 'as experts' as to the kind of religious instruction suitable for the Board schools, announced their intention of giving 'such instruction in the future without reference to the circular.' This was an open defiance of the Board, whose servants they were, and in the spirit of that defiance they have been acting ever since; the number of teachers so acting was nearly 3,000. The Daily Chronicle, in commenting upon what passed at the Board, stated that in one of his speeches Mr. Riley said: 'He intends to use every legitimate means in his power to prevent any one of the 3,000 teachers from acquiring any position of authority under the Board.' Mr. Riley denied that he used these words, but acknowledged that when a teacher's name that had been mentioned was before the Board for promotion, he looked to see whether his was one of the 3,000; but eventually on hearing more about him he voted for his appointment though he was amongst the recalcitrants. For this manly and outspoken behaviour the secular press lectured Mr. Riley severely, as though he had been guilty of a grave moral offence in requiring that the Board School teachers should obey the Jan.

prac-

er of

itrev.

olitan

chool

(who

cular

ed to

utrey

teach

bias

or all

ne re-

achers

there-

Board

were

to be

ter to

con-

circu-

nifesto

Metro-

ed not

st, and

ind of

ounced

with-

ance of

of that

ber of

ronicle,

ed that

to use

one of

thority

these

hat had

looked

ally on

though

nd out-

everely,

ence in

bey the

directions of their employers on a most important matter for which the School Board was responsible. In thus following what seemed to them the popular opinion, it appears to us that the newspapers condemned themselves, and not Mr. Riley; and practically said that the approval of the multitude was a matter of more importance than defending the right and asserting the In these days of compromise and unbelief there are comparatively few men who have the courage of their opinions, and who dare to say what they know may be unpopular, and lead them into unpleasant controversy, and we honour Mr. Riley for being amongst the few men who do not shrink from saying what in their opinion is just and true and ought to be said.

This was the first muttering of what was intended to be a storm; but so far as we can see the waves decline to rise, and the attempts to excite an outcry against additional help to Voluntary schools have fallen somewhat flat. Mr. George Dixon, one of the members for Birmingham, and chairman of the School Board of that city, has endeavoured to resuscitate the Birmingham league, whose watchwords in 1870 were education secular, compulsory, and free. He speaks of himself as a Churchman, but to judge from what he says we should fear that he has little knowledge of what the Church teaches, and that his religion is subordinated to his politics. His attack upon increased help to the Voluntary schools was well answered in the Birmingham Post by an old ally of his, who had read the signs of the times more correctly than he had done. Leaders of the Liberal party and some members of the late Government have expressed themselves strongly against any further help to Voluntary schools, although we should have thought they scarcely would have ventured to do so if they had any respect for the opinion of the majority of the people, to which they so much delight in expressing their unflinching loyalty and steadfast obedience. Besides this there have been several autumn gatherings of the preachers of divers Nonconformist bodies, at which resolutions have been passed in the sense just named. And we believe there are one or two minor bodies, consisting of one or two active persons who hate the Church and all her ways, who have paraded their resolutions in the newspapers as though they were empowered to speak in the name of the people of England. When Parliament meets there will no doubt be frantic efforts on the part of the party made up of men of very different opinions, who unite only when a question affecting the welfare of the Church is before them, to frighten the Government into withholding all

re

ir

p

ra

ar

to

be

th

pe

A

qu

ex

to

bo

sho

SOI

por

opi

sou

the

me

to b

in t

but

further help from a religious cause which these adversaries unite in hating, but we shall be much deceived in Lord Salisbury and his colleagues if such a party of opponents

should frighten them.

Whilst these efforts were being made by the friends of universal School Boards to hinder further assistance being extended in any form to the managers of Voluntary schools, Churchmen have not been idle in pressing forward the interests of the schools with which they are connected. During the autumn a number of diocesan conferences have been held, and at every one the needs of the Voluntary schools have been insisted upon, and resolutions passed urging the Government to fulfil the expectations which they have so happily raised. Though many differing suggestions have been made as to the manner in which the required relief should be given, we are not aware of a single resolution having been passed at any of them disapproving of the proposals of the Archbishops' committee, whilst by many of them those proposals have been heartily supported.

In consequence, however, of external and other criticisms upon the scheme, the Archbishops thought it desirable to summon a conference of experts, some of whom had put forth plans of their own, in the hope that by this means Churchmen might present a united front to the Government. It was at one time thought possible that the Roman Catholics might have been willing to join with Churchmen in a common representation of the wants of the Voluntary schools; and a few members of the Archbishops' committee met two gentlemen deputed by Cardinal Vaughan, when the question was well considered. But it was found that the Roman Catholic demands were at once more extensive and in some respects different from those of Churchmen, and so it was thought better for the

two bodies to act independently.

The proposals formulated by the Archbishops' conference and sent to the Prime Minister differ but little from those described in the October number of this Review. The only additions of any importance are 'that there should be a rearrangement of all Government grants, so that poorer schools may share equitably with richer schools in those grants. The reason for this request is that at present a considerable portion of the Government grant depends upon the children taking up what are technically described as class and specific subjects, for passing in which separate payments are made. The effect of this educationally is that teachers are tempted to instruct their scholars in those subjects which are most easily

XUM

mastered, and for which grants are paid, although there is no chance of the children ever profiting in after life by what they thus learn. If there were a fixed grant, varied as in infant schools to suit the attainments of the school, and if it were left to her Majesty's inspector to direct what subjects should be studied by the children, the probability is that they would receive a better education, that they would learn what was most likely to interest them, and that every school would be required to teach what was most likely to profit the children in after life, and not that which promised to secure the largest immediate addition to the school finances.

A second point suggested is that the School Board precepts should be sent to the County Council or some other popularly elected body, instead of being sent direct to the rating authority with directions to collect the amount. The fact that another body would have the power to overlook and, if necessary, within certain limits to revise the demands to be made upon the ratepayers, would probably do something towards checking that reckless extravagance of which many School Boards are guilty, and by which no one is benefited, but from which many poor ratepayers suffer grievously.

The only other additional request is that the proposed changes may be embodied in an Act of Parliament, so that the managers of schools may no longer suffer from the perpetual alterations to which they have hitherto been subject.

These are all the additions made to the proposals of the Archbishops' committee; but there was besides an important alteration. The conference apparently thought that the request for all the teachers to be paid out of the Imperial exchequer was too definite, and that if the memorial went up to the Government in this form those in authority might feel bound either to accept or reject it, and if their conclusion should be adverse that it might imperil the assistance which is sorely needed; or if not that, it might cause it to be postponed for another year. Moreover, there was a difference of opinion amongst them, whether the desired aid should be sought from the taxes or the rates. They therefore constructed the paragraph asking for more pecuniary help in this form:

Jan.

ries

ord

ents

s of

eing

ools,

nte-

ring

neld.

nave

ern-

pily

nade

iven.

ed at

lops'

been

isms

e to

forth

men

as at

night

n re-

a few

emen

con-

ands

erent

r the

rence

those

only

a re-

hools

ants.

rable

ldren

ecific

nade.

ted to

easily

<sup>&#</sup>x27;An increase of contributions from public sources sufficient to meet the general increased cost of education throughout the country, to be administered in such a manner as will prevent what is harmful in the competition between Voluntary and Board schools.'

<sup>&#</sup>x27;While on the whole we think it better that the required contributions should come from the Imperial exchequer rather than from

the local rates, we recognize the difficulties which surround the question, and we desire to express our readiness, speaking generally, to support other definite proposals which may be formulated by her Majesty's Government, and which would give the necessary relief.'

It has been generally understood that this memorial was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee of experts to whom it was submitted.

It may be well to compare with this the memorial forwarded by the Roman Catholics to the Prime Minister, which is dated November 13, and appeared in the Times on the following day. It runs as follows:

'We desire respectfully to press upon the Government our strong hope that you will see your way at an early day to carry out the educational policy in support of which a large number of members have been returned to Parliament by the late elections. We allude to the definite pledges, asked for and freely given, to promote, if returned, any measure which shall place all public elementary schools in England and Wales upon a footing of perfect equality, as to pay-

ment, for the education given within their walls.

'The main provision upon which we insist is that there shall be such a revision of the education laws as may at last establish a national system of public elementary education which shall be just to all. It should (1) pay alike out of the public funds all elementary schools satisfying the Education Department for the secular education given to the people; and it should (2) frankly recognize the right and duty of parents to have their children educated in schools of their own religion without thereby incurring, as they incur at present, privation and pecuniary penalty. We hold parental rights affecting the religious education of children to be sacred and inalienable, and that no encroachment upon them can be attempted by the State without violation of human liberties in their very source and cradle.'

As supports to the above demand the following additional reasons are given:

'Your Lordship and the Cabinet cannot be aware of how painfully Catholics are frequently compelled, especially in the North of England, to spend many hours of Saturday night and Sunday in every week of the year in the streets gathering pence for the support of their schools from working men, who can ill afford this additional tax upon their wages. We must add that these voluntary subscriptions, or alms, have now become a sign of religious disability, and are paid as a penalty for conscience' sake.

A further and inevitable result of the use of two scales of payment for the same public service is that our schools are often starved, our teachers underpaid, our pupil teachers overworked, and our apparatus inferior as compared with Board Schools, while the private resources, which might have been spent on the improvement

of boi bee pul not sch

par det the able Th of que

can

me

who mei sac lam any Mo cari eler tena at n a pi ima

be a hith twe! had the anot stric thos pay satis tion

sma

prop struc to b that

Cath

of buildings, are absorbed in meeting expenses that ought to be borne by the State.

'We note with regret that the opposition which has constantly been offered to any scheme proposed for the equal payment of all public elementary schools seems to have been dictated, not by a noble interest in the education of children attending Voluntary schools, not by a desire to maintain the rights and liberties of parents and respect for their conscientious convictions, but by a determination to extinguish the denominational schools and to replace them by Board schools, which, as undenominational, are not acceptable to the majority of the population.'

This memorial is signed by Cardinal Vaughan and the Duke of Norfolk. There is much more in it which we need not

quote.

The chief proposal in this memorial, though just in itself, cannot be accepted as a satisfactory arrangement by Church-In the first place they would be unwilling to throw the whole cost of the education of the children of the poorer members of their flocks upon the State. They regard it as a sacred trust committed to them to do what they can for these lambs of their Master's flock, and they would be opposed to any plan which would place this responsibility in other hands. Moreover, they are convinced that it would be impossible to carry out the scheme proposed without virtually making all elementary schools Board schools. If the whole cost of maintenance is to be furnished out of public funds, in some way and at no distant time those who supply all the money will demand a predominant share in the management. It is a dream to imagine that it can be otherwise. It is just possible that a small religious body, with less than a thousand schools, might be able to escape for a time, as the Jewish schools have done hitherto in London; but it would be impossible for the nearly twelve thousand Church schools to do so. And when these had been closed or brought under the power of School Boards, the minor interests would be made to submit. There is another clause in the memorial that would probably have a stricter interpretation placed upon it than was intended by those who drew it up. The claim is that the State 'should pay alike out of the public funds all elementary schools satisfying the Education Department for the secular education given to the people.' Does that mean that the Roman Catholics will raise a special fund to pay the teachers for the proportion of the school time devoted to religious instruction? If it means that, there would remain a large sum to be raised by voluntary contributions. Or does it mean that the State shall pay all that the teachers are to receive?

Jan. the

ally, her was

erts fornich the

rong bers lude e, if nools pay-

ll be sh a just ntary lucathe nools esent, cting , and State adle.'

ional nfully th of lay in pport tional scrip-

payoften i, and le the ement

, and

TI

re

bu

"I

be

ma Pre

the

dif

W

· If

Sc

WO

be

ind

the

the the

wit

ple

by

reli

still

sho

nev

Th

chi

the

329

Du

be

of s

be

diff

pre

whe

req

be i

the

chil

mei

'Th

peri

In which case it would pay for the religious as well as the secular instruction. There is a sentence in a later part of the memorial which may possibly be meant to point to the latter of these interpretations as the one intended. It says that in the event of the money granted by the State being insufficient, and the School Boards having to raise an additional amount by rate, the Voluntary schools shall share equally with the Board schools in the money so obtained. Of course, if the State grant is to be applied exclusively to secular instruction, the Boards would have to raise by rate any amount which they might have to pay for the religious instruction in their schools, In that case, if the Roman Catholic claim were allowed, they would participate on equal terms in the funds so obtained. It is almost needless to say that probably under such circumstances few if any School Boards would give religious instruction. Their schools would become purely secular; and we should be surprised if the Roman Catholics would find that they had improved their position to the extent they desire if their request should be granted.

On the appointed day the memorial prepared at the instigation of the two Archbishops was presented to Lord Salisbury and the President and Vice-President of the Council by a deputation of Churchmen. This deputation included the two Archbishops, twenty-eight Bishops, several peers, a considerable number of Conservative and Liberal-Unionist members of Parliament, and a large number of Church dignitaries and eminent laymen taking an active part in educational matters. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London introduced the subject, and based the requests made in the memorial very much on the grounds which have been set forth in this *Review*. They were supported by the Earl of Jersey, speaking as a member of the House of Lords, and Sir Edward Clarke, as representing and supporting the Govern-

ment in the House of Commons. Sir Edward said:

'He wished to remind the Prime Minister that the supporters of the Government in the House of Commons-and that was, he was glad to say, a very large body—were practically united on this question. It was also a subject which was of universal interest among them. Then he He suggested would say next that immediate action was needed. that the present Parliamentary position was singularly advantageous for the carrying out of the work, and there was no doubt that any scheme which the Government were prepared to press on firmly would get the support of three-fourths of the members of the House of Commons. He did not think that there was any measure which would be passed that would give greater satisfaction, or would confer greater benefits on the country.'

The Duke of Devonshire, as Lord President of the Council, then replied before Lord Salisbury spoke. With respect to the removal of the 17s. 6d. limit, and the 'exemption' of school buildings from rates, he said:

'I believe the relief which would be given by these measures would be entirely in the direction which you desire; and, subject to what may be said by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and what the President of the Local Government Board might have to say in the matter, I do not see that there would be any departmental difficulty in giving effect to these suggestions.'

With regard to the increased grant asked for, he says:

'If, on the one hand, any such increased grant could be applied by School Boards to the increase of salaries and other expenditure, it would be a very extravagant expenditure, and nothing would then be done to relieve the Voluntary schools from that competition; and indeed that competition might to some extent be increased. the other hand, that addition to the fixed grant should be applied by the managers of our Voluntary schools to reduction of subscriptions, the aim which you have in view of competing on more equal terms with the Board schools could not be attained. I observe with great pleasure it has been stated in the memorial, and it has been repeated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, that Churchmen had no wish to relieve themselves from the sacrifices which they have been and are But still statistics of the Education Department do still making. show that, while the cost of education per child has been increasing, nevertheless the voluntary subscriptions have diminished.'

This is not a fair statement; for though the subscriptions per child may be less owing to the increased number of children, the amount of voluntary subscriptions has increased from 329,846%. in 1870 to 622,034% in 1894. Besides this, the Duke said that if the 175.6d limit were removed there would be no more need for increased facilities for the confederation of schools. If any specified amount of subscriptions should be required, this would not be the case; for it would be difficult to fix an amount that each school must raise without pressing heavily upon some schools in the poorest districts, whereas it would be quite another matter if a certain sum were required from a confederated number of schools, as some would be in richer districts and others in poorer. To the request that the parents should be able to claim religious instruction for their children in their own faith, the Duke made no reference.

Lord Salisbury dealt more sympathetically with the memorial. He said:

'There were two main difficulties, two practical points in our experience, as to the manner in which the Act (of 1870) contravenes

which confer

Jan.

s the

f the

ter of

n the

t by

Board

State

n, the

they lools.

they

ined.

cum-

s in-

; and

find

desire

he in-

Lord

ouncil

luded

ers, a

ionist

digni-

tional

op of

made

Carl of

nd Sir

overn-

of the

glad to

It was

hen he

ggested

ageous

hat any firmly

House

what have hitherto been held the fundamental principles in English legislation and administration. The Board schools were set up to satisfy a crying need, to supply education where it did not exist, but the religious difficulty was very strongly felt, and the answer given was: There are the Voluntary schools by the side of the Board Those parents who do not like the religious education of the Board schools will always have an opportunity of resorting to the other schools. So long as the Board schools did not act as an agency for exterminating Voluntary schools, that answer was perfect and complete. But now that you have compulsory education, so that every parent must send his child to a school, you have the operation of a machinery which seems destined at no very distant period to remove a great number of the schools which provide the religious education that the parents might desire, and you are therefore approaching a system, absolutely unknown before, where certain religious beliefs shall subject the parents to almost penal consequences, or, at least, to grave and serious disabilities. Of course since that timesince 1870—there has sprung up a defence of the system to which we are hastening. We are assured, though we do not know it, that Board schools really teach religion. Roman Catholics are not represented in this room, nor do they share in your memorial, but their feelings and desires will naturally have to be considered, and they have always repudiated most indignantly the idea that the religion taught in the Board schools is a religion which they can be expected to recognize or accept. The objection on the part of members of the Church of England is not so intense or so universal, but still it is very strong, and so far as I am able to judge it is growing and not diminishing, both in area and intensity. Nonconformists are well satisfied with the religious teaching of the Board schools. I do not grudge them in the least the advantage of having maintained at the public cost a system of religious teaching which is practically their own. I do not grudge it to them, and I hope they will always have that facility, but it is naturally the desire of other religious bodies to have equal facilities. That is why, from the point of religious liberty, we desire, so far as we can do it, to assist the Voluntary schools in their trouble, and to take off them the stress under which they are now suffering.'

The other difficulty to which Lord Salisbury referred was the pecuniary one. He admired the motives which prompted School Boards to expend money to make the education they give as good as possible; but those who had to provide the money did not always take the same view. In the spending departments of the State a check was provided upon them by the Treasury, and he thought something of the kind was needed for School Boards. He said:

'I cannot help feeling that there has been expenditure, both in its character and in the class for whom it is applied, not intended by those who originally passed the Education Act, which was not cont

mee prop than vant doulitsel men dend by 1 their If, o

will feeli be mee peti mos unti will slack posi

bury

to.

the He that upon the salie primeduc (2) 1 either

denc

pani (3) t

which

by th

Jan.

es in

re set

nswer

Board

on of

ng to

as an

erfect

on, so opera-

iod to

igious

roach-

us be-

or, at

ime-

ch we

t, that

ot re-

contemplated by them, and would be repudiated by them with considerable energy. Some check of that kind is necessary.'

Here the question must practically rest until Parliament meets. The Government will certainly not make public the proposals that they will lay before the Legislature any sooner than they can help, for that will give an unnecessary advantage to their opponents; but those opponents will no doubt avail themselves of every opportunity that may present itself to thwart what it is evidently the intention of Government to do. Schemes will be invented for them and be denounced. The utterances of leading men will be distorted by partisans; and if they imagine that there is sympathy for their views, no doubt recourse will be had to public meetings. If, on the other hand, the people are found to be irresponsive to their outcries, then other means will no doubt be resorted to. What we hope is, that the friends of religious teaching will not allow themselves to be lulled into quietude by a feeling of security. The movements of our opponents must be watched, and when necessary opposed. If they hold meetings, our friends must do the same; if they promote petitions to Parliament, our friends must do the same. It is most important for us to realize that nothing has been gained until we have legal security that the assistance we are seeking will be given. Until that has been accomplished we must not slacken our efforts, or cease to call upon those who are in a position to help to continue to do what they can.

A week after the Church deputation had seen Lord Salisbury and the Duke of Devonshire, the Wesleyans delivered a counterblast. Their deputation was headed by Mr. Fowler, the Secretary of State for India under the late Government. He sought to conciliate the Prime Minister by assuring him that the deputation was not a political one, and he insisted upon the importance of the interest it represented by recounting the size of the chapels in which its ministers preached and the number of its Sunday and day schools and scholars. The salient points of the memorial presented were: (1) That the primary object of Methodist policy in the matter of elementary education is the establishment of School Boards everywhere; (2) that there should be no increased grant of public funds, either from local rates or from the Imperial exchequer, to denominational schools, unless that increased grant is accompanied by adequate and representative public management; (3) that no system of national education will be acceptable which excludes the Bible and religious instruction therefrom by the teachers; (4) 'that our connexional training colleges

d they eligion pected pers of ll it is d not e well do not at the v their always igious of re-Volununder d was

d was
mpted
in they
de the
inding
em by
d was

oth in tended as not should be maintained in full vigour and efficiency;' and it was urged that the 'conscience clause' had proved inefficient, and a demand was made 'for a local educational authority to take cognizance of any complaints which may be made by parents or guardians of offences against conscience or religious liberty in the conduct of any school.' This last demand was made because it was asserted that

'in not a few day schools of the Church of England religious intolerance and bigotry of an exceedingly offensive character are systematically taught the scholars during the hours set apart for religious instruction by means of a special catechism, such as it ought not to be possible to teach in connexion with any public school of the nation.'

It might be worth while to inquire whether the teaching thus objected to materially differs from what is given in all Roman Catholic schools with respect to members of the Church of England and others, and about which Church people never think of troubling themselves.

Various members of the deputation dwelt upon the hardships inflicted upon the children of Nonconformists where there was only a Church school, a hardship often asserted but never proved, though those who make it are constantly

challenged to prove their words.

Lord Salisbury in his reply thought if the Nonconformists had not so steadfastly resisted a religious census the evils of which they complain would long since have been removed if they had been found to be real. He said:

'I should have great hope that this particular evil might be met if proper attention were paid to it, and if those who feel it and wish to remedy it would give up the unprofitable chase after Church schools, or the unprofitable campaign against them.'

The remedy he recommended was 'simply the multiplication of denominational schools.' He continued:

'What I feel in listening to an argument of this kind is surprise that those who think differently from us do not apparently in the least appreciate the point of view of the Anglican Church in this matter. When you say you value religious education—in which statement I most heartily concur—it seems to me strange that the religious education which you propose is a religious education where our religion is not taught—which is to be taught by teachers who are not of our religion, and to be managed by managers who are not of our religion. I do not think this sounds like a practical arrangement, or one that would endure for any length of time.'

It would have been difficult for the Anglican view of what is required to make religious education worthy of the name to hone to u had

1896

scho sing hith num the port Lib agai

to is

tive

the junde over towa who musi equi decla giver

scho

bury resp futu deta insti that very very and who

elem far f

Catl

and it ficient, rity to ide by ligious and was

Jan.

ous inter are part for th as it public

Roman arch of never

e hard-

where

stantly formists evils of loved if

be met l it and Church

lication

surprise y in the in this n which that the n where who are re not of arrange-

of what e name to have been better stated than it was by his Lordship, and one can only hope that the members of the deputation learned to understand the Church view of the question better than they had done before.

The presentation of this memorial by the Wesleyans has been followed by an animated discussion in the *Times* relative to a Catechism alleged to be taught in many Church schools. The Wesleyans have been challenged to name a single school in which it was taught, and their answers have hitherto evaded this challenge and only insisted upon the number of copies sold. On the other hand the publisher of the Catechism and others have asserted that a considerable portion of the copies sold were purchased by members of the Liberation Society for the purpose of creating a prejudice against the religious teaching in Church schools.

The Roman Catholic bishops have thought it necessary to issue a declaration, in which they say:

'While offering no objection to the work of supererogation which the great wealth of the Anglican Church enables the archbishops to undertake on its behalf, namely, to promise an annual largess of over 600,000/. (representing at 3 per cent. a capital of 20,000,000/.) towards maintenance in their public elementary schools, Catholics are wholly unable to act with a like generosity, but in their poverty they must be content to stand upon the common ground of justice and equity, and to demand, at least for themselves, that the law shall declare that the same payment shall be made for secular instruction given in their public elementary schools as for that given in Board schools.'

We do not feel quite sure that the Archbishop of Canterbury did not speak more strongly than the facts warranted respecting the subscriptions which might be relied on in the future for Church schools. Those who have to do with the details of the accounts of Church schools and educational institutions must have been struck with the much larger sums that are contributed locally by clergymen, often themselves very poor, and by the comparatively small number of the very wealthy and of those placed in high positions in Church and State who give liberally to the funds raised from the whole country for Church educational purposes.

With another paragraph of the declaration of the Roman Catholic bishops we have more sympathy:

'In their demand that the whole cost of maintenance in their public elementary schools shall be defrayed by the State, Catholics are still far from being in line with Nonconformists and others who have obtained, through the Board school system, palatial buildings, costly

lan.

18

to

of

th

ar

VIC

m

by

pr

a l

me

Go

the

and

tio

sar

the

be

upe

sho

wh

cer

sai

aid

me

ass

as

sch

tio

administration, ample maintenance, and religious instruction to their liking, at the sole cost of the State.'

On December 6 there was a meeting at the rooms of the National Society of representatives of the Diocesan Boards of Education, when a resolution approving the memorial presented to the Government by the deputation, headed by the two Archbishops, was approved by a unanimous vote. only important point discussed at length was the admission of representatives of the ratepayers on to the committees of management of the Voluntary schools. And here there was a curious difference of opinion: Conservative Lancashire, where Churchmen have a majority on most School Boards, thought there would be no danger in such a course, whilst representatives from the Liberal West Riding, where Churchmen have generally been in a minority, warned the meeting that such admission would be fraught with danger. It seems to follow almost as a matter of course that every man should judge the whole country by the experience derived from his own neighbourhood, just as people generally judge other people's motives by what their own would naturally be under similar circumstances; so that bad people are generally suspicious, good people confiding. We should be glad to think that in what the eminent speakers who oppose further help to Voluntary schools will say they would bear this consideration in mind, and would forbear from condemning their opponents for plans which they have never entertained, and for proposals which they have never made. If only they would be content to depend upon what has actually happened for their facts, and not upon their own imaginations, we might hope that in this important question of education we might come to a fair and friendly adjustment.

As this article is passing through the press, there has appeared in the papers an account of the reception of two deputations on the education question by the Duke of Devonshire at Birmingham. The Birmingham and Midland Education League, headed by Mr. George Dixon, M.P., came to protest against the reopening of the elementary education compromise of 1870, and against items contained in the memorial presented by the two Archbishops and others: whilst the Voluntary Schools Defence Union, headed by the Bishop of Coventry, came to plead in an opposite direction. The Duke, in his cautious reply, elicited from Mr. Dixon that 'he and his colleagues did not desire the extinction of the Voluntary schools.' He asked from him, as well as from the other deputation, whether they wished the compromise of 1870

wh wo fess

be i

its

peo

Jan.

to their

of the Boards

al preby the The sion of

tees of re was cashire. Boards,

whilst hurchneeting seems

should his own people's

similar picious, that in Volun-

tion in ponents roposals content

ir facts, that in to a fair

has apof two Devonnd Educame to lucation in the others:

d by the irection. xon that n of the

of 1870

from the

to be disturbed; but from neither deputation could be obtain a definite reply, as both deputations said there was a difference of opinion amongst themselves. To the League he said that the matter was still under consideration, and the Cabinet had arrived at no conclusion on the subject. To the Defence Union he said:

'I appealed to the former deputation to bear in mind that the views expressed in the memorial of the Archbishops were not simply the views of a certain number of the dignitaries of the Church or clergymen of the Church of England, but that they were views entertained by a very large number of the supporters of the Government, and presumably by a very considerable number of the electors. While I make the same admission to you, I would beg you to remember that a large number of the supporters of the Government, both in Parliament and out of it-perhaps not a majority of the supporters of the Government, but still a considerable number, whose support, I think, the whole Unionist party would be very sorry to do anything to alienate or estrange-hold views of an entirely opposite character, and I am sure that you, while very properly urging on the consideration of the Government the measures which you may think necessary to preserve the existence of religious schools-denominational schools—will admit that we are bound to approach this subject with the greatest consideration for the conscientious scruples which may be felt by any portion of our supporters, and also it is incumbent upon us to take the utmost care that nothing should be done which should even have the appearance of a desire to lower the standard which has been reached of educational efficiency.'

If we might venture to state our own conclusions concerning his present view of the subject from what the Duke said, we should say that he sees his way to giving increased aid to Voluntary schools, but that he does not see his way to meddle with the Board schools. Of one thing he may rest assured: that there will be no cessation of agitation so long as the children of Church parents are compelled to attend schools in which they must either receive no religious instruction, or only such as their parents do not believe. If every locality in which Board schools existed were free to settle what religious teaching should be given in their schools, it would be somewhat different; but for the State, which professes to believe in religious liberty and to have no religion of its own, to force a religion of its own manufacture upon people who despise it can never be successful. For it must be remembered that undenominationalism is as much a religion as Socinianism, Unitarianism, Agnosticism, or Atheism.

## SHORT NOTICES.

The Apocrypha, translated out of the Greek and Latin Tongues being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most Ancient Authorities and revised A.D. 1894. (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1895.)

THE English translation of the Apocrypha, A.D. 1611, was preceded by those of the older English Bibles-Tyndale's and Coverdale's, 1535; Mathews's, 1537; Whitchurch's or Cranmer's, 1539; Geneva, 1560. The earlier translations were based upon the old Latin Vulgate, the books and fragments being interlaced with the Hebrew Scriptures, and the text in some of the books differing widely from the most approved Greek copies. The first step in revision was to resort to a Greek text in preference to the Vulgate, where a Greek text of sufficient authority was accessible. consequence of the enumeration in the Articles of Religion of books possessing ecclesiastical authority, it was found necessary to retain the books included in the old Vulgate, even when the passages for which no basis could be found in the Greek text were omitted as interpolations. Thus the English Apocrypha differs from the Canon of the Council of Trent, both by excluding passages which the latter authorizes, and including books and fragments which the latter The English reader may observe the points of difference by a comparison of the Douay English Bible with the Authorized and Revised Versions, and it may be noted that the Vulgate edition of the Apocrypha is followed in the quotations in the Homilies, in the sentences of the Offertory, and in the Service for the Solemnization of Matrimony.

In 1611 the translators were directed to use the earlier translations when they agreed better with the text than the Bishops' Bible. The translators were divided into classes, and the 'Prayer of Manasses' and the rest of the Apocrypha were consigned to 'the Second Cambridge Class,' consisting of seven, viz.: 1. John Duport, D.D., Master of Jesus College and Prebendary of Ely.<sup>1</sup> 2. Dr. William Braithwaite, Master of Caius College. 3. Jeremiah Radcliffe, Fellow of Trinity College. 4. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College and Margaret Professor. 5. Andrew Downes, Greek Professor. 6. John Bois, Prebendary of Ely. 7. Mr. Ward, Fellow of King's College and Prebendary of Chichester.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Bissell <sup>3</sup> says that their authorities were (1) the Latin translation of the Apocrypha by Junius, (2) the Complutensian Polyglot, (3) the Aldine edition of the LXX., 1518. The last was their chief authority for 1 Esdras, which was not included in the Complutensian edition. The Roman edition of the LXX., 1587, was also in their hands, but a preference was sometimes shown to the Aldine copy.

3 General Introduction to the Apocrypha, p. 61.

bet The and wer Per text

189

pola pref Mos whe of the Vers and litur are in cl the of P a bil to th mark 'As of th withi knew comp Code More

Mos in h Criti revis cabe Aldi autho tions revise that ! Chale Gree! matte

of E

the d VC

Revis

<sup>1</sup> Some have considered Dr. James Dupont, who at this time was Greek Professor and Fellow of Trinity College, as the person here intended. Todd, Authentic Account of the Authorized Translation, 1838.

Jan

gues

most it the

pre-

539

e old

h the fering

ep in

lgate, But in books

retain

ted as

Canon

latter

erence

dition

lies, in

mniza-

ransla-Bible.

yer of

o 'the

. John

f Ely.1

remiah

ster of

Greek

Fellow

11 3 says

ocrypha

ition of

, which

edition

s some-

s Greek

ided.

338.

In the new revised English Apocrypha the work was divided between the London, Westminster, and Cambridge Committees. The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach was entrusted to the first, the 1st Book of Maccabees, Tobit, and Judith to the second, and Wisdom and the 2nd Book of Maccabees to the third. The remaining books were afterwards entrusted to a fourth committee, of which Dr. Perowne, at that time Dean of Peterborough, was the chairman.

The most important changes made by the first committee are textual. A considerable number of passages are excluded as interpolations, the more concise form of the approved Greek text being preferred to the redundant phrases of the other ancient versions. Most of the omitted passages are repetitions of matter found elsewhere, but some are more worthy of note, such as the 'five operations of the Lord' in chap. xvii. 5, which is bracketed in the Authorized Version; and the verse in chap. xxiv., 'I am the Mother of fair love and fear and knowledge, and holy hope,' which is associated in liturgical use with the Festivals of the B. V. M. Longer passages are excluded in chap. xxvi. 19–27, chiefly on woman's wickedness; in chap. xix. 18–21, on the fear of the Lord and the knowledge of the Commandments; and in chap. xvi. 15–16, on the hardening of Pharaoh. A more notable omission occurs in xxv. 26, 'Give her a bill of divorce, and let her go.' Mr. Scrivener in his Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph Bible mentions the two interpolations marked in the margin of the Bible of 1611:

'As a small instalment of what remains to be done for the criticism of this noble work, two passages (chaps. i. 7 and xvii. 5) are enclosed within brackets. The former is found in no Greek text our Translators knew of, but only in the Latin and Bishops' Bible. The latter occurs complete only in some late manuscripts, though the Complutensian and Codex 248 have the last two lines of the triplet.'

More than forty passages are excluded from the new revised version of Ecclesiasticus; these occur chiefly in the first half of the book. Most of these interpolations were noted by Dr. Bissell of New York in his edition of the Apocrypha, 'Revised Translation, with Notes Critical and Explanatory,' 1880.

The Westminster division of the committee took in hand the revision of the Books of Tobit, Judith, and the 1st Book of Maccabees. Here the translators of 1611 made use of the Complutensian, Aldine, and Roman editions of the Greek text, 'by means of which authorities they were enabled to clear the text of Tobit of the accretions brought into the old Latin version, which had been overhastily revised by Jerome.' It appears, however, from Jerome's own account that the Tobit which he produced was a free translation of an old Chaldee copy, not a correction of the Latin by any Greek text. The Greek texts show no variations of special interest; the additional matter is peculiar to the Latin and Semitic forms of the story. The Revised Apocrypha follows the Paragraph Bible and Dr. Bissell in the division of the prayer of Tobit (ch. xiii.) into στίχοι. It might be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Scrivener.

T

th

ra

th

· k

sto

fo

e n

22

ma

of

im

"G

the

me

the

cor

Sor

two

the

Ap

gen is c the

in (

Apo

Orie adde bein viii.

Lati

The

versi

ings-

mitte

doub will l

7

a question whether a similar arrangement might not be adopted for the 'precepts of Tobit' in chap. iv. The text of Judith is left very much as it was in 1611, with a few changes in the proper names—as, Nebuchadnezzar for Nebuchodonosor, and the arrangement of the hymn (chap. xvi.) in  $\sigma ri\chi oi$ .

In the 1st Book of Maccabees the variations of text are fewer than in other parts of the Apocrypha. Scrivener enumerates those which were noted in the margin of the English Bible. Some of these have been adopted by the Revisers-as, 'tyrannies' or 'principalities' for 'kings' or 'tyrants,' in ch. i. 4; changes of proper names, as Gaddis for Caddis (ch. ii. 3), Gazara for Gazera (ch. iv. 15), Akrabattine for Arabattine (ch. v. 3), Tubias for Tobie (ch. v. 13), Bosora for Bosor, margin Bosora (ch. v. 26), Gilgal for Galgala (ch. ix. 2), Nadabath for Nadabatha (ch. ix. 37), Odomera for Odonarkes (ch. ix. 66), Kedesh for Cades (ch. xi. 63). In the last passage the reading 'from his office' is preferred by the Revisers to the old rendering 'from the country.' Such alterations in the English as 'lawless' for 'wicked' and 'heaven forbid' for 'God forbid' are of slight importance, and doubtful as improvements. With Cotton's translation the Revisers retain 'place of exercise' where Dr. Bissell gives 'gymnasium.' Emphatic attention is called to the expression 'friends of the king' wherever it occurs in the book, and there are a

few marginal references to Josephus. The chief labours of the Cambridge committee were directed to the Book of Wisdom. Here we are brought closer to the mind of the original writer than in other parts of the Apocrypha, for he was undoubtedly a Jew of Alexandria, having Greek for his mother tongue; and his Platonism and Homeric phrases prove his acquaintance with Greek literature. It is, however, a difficult book to translate, and it can only be fully appreciated when it is read in The Cambridge Committee have used a free method of translation in many places, even where a more literal rendering might appear equally intelligible and more acceptable to the reader. In chap. i. 3, 'The power of God putteth to confusion the foolish,' and in v. 5, 'The holy spirit will be put to confusion when unrighteousness hath come in,' is harsh and not literal. The old marginal reading was 'is rebuked' or 'showeth itself,' and there was in the author a probable reminiscence of the words 'My spirit shall no more strive with man.' It may well be doubted whether the rendering of  $\kappa \tau i \sigma \iota s$  (in Alex.  $\kappa \tau \eta \sigma \iota s$ ) by 'creation' is satisfactory; still less can 'the whole creation' be accepted as a true rendering of κτίσις in chap. v. 17. The word rather denotes any of the powers of nature, which are the instruments or weapons of the Almighty for the punishment of the wicked. The Revisers seem to have been influenced by a dislike of technical or conventional phrases when they disguised the four cardinal virtues of the Greek ethics as 'soberness and understanding, righteousness and courage,' in chap. viii. 7, where we have been accustomed to read 'temperance, prudence, justice, and fortitude.' Perhaps there was an anxiety to restrict the word 'justice' to 'retributive justice' or δίκη. The various words to

Jan

l for

very

f the

fewer those

these

lities'

es, as

. 15),

7. 13),

algala

ra for le last

sers to

nglish

id' are

otton's

Bissell

ression

e are a

cted to

nind of

he was

mother

equaint-

read in

ethod of

endering

e reader.

foolish,

hen un-

The old

here was

pirit shall

ether the

sfactory;

dering of

powers of

nighty for

ave been

ases when

as 'sober-

ap. viii. 7, prudence,

estrict the

s words to

PS-

represent the animals by which the enemies of God's people were scourged constitute a difficulty in translation; but 'wretched vermin' (chap. ii. 15) as applied to the objects of Egyptian worship (κνώδαλα εὐτελη) is surely an exaggeration of the writer's meaning. verse of this chapter is rendered by the Revisers 'O Sovereign Lord, Thou lover of men's lives.' The reason for abandoning the literal sense, 'Lover of Souls,' is not evident, and the change is open to the objection that it narrows the sense and ascribes to the writer the idea that the loving care of the Almighty is for the preservation of the race rather than for the welfare of each individual soul. The Divine philanthropy as expressed in the book should rather be regarded as one with the 'kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man,' mentioned in Titus iii. 4. In chap. vii. 3 the rendering of  $\delta\mu\omega\omega\pi\alpha\theta\hat{\eta}$  by 'kindred' is a happier one. The idea is that 'Mother Earth' receives the new-born infant as a kindly nurse, and not as a harsh stepmother, as in the descriptions by Pliny and Lucretius of the forlornness and helplessness of the human child. The use of 'nature' for ὑπόστασις in the passage about the manna, in chap. xvi. 22, is more doubtful, but the meaning is obscure. The alterations made by the Cambridge committee in the version of the 2nd Book of Maccabees are numerous, but very few of them are of any great importance or interest. In chap. viii. 20 'Gauls' is substituted for 'Galatians,' the word in the Greek text being Γαλάταs, as indicated in the margin.

Dr. Perowne's committee revised the remaining books and fragments, viz. the interpolations in the Greek Esther, the two Esdrases, the additions to Daniel, Baruch, and the Prayer of Manasses. These contain poetical portions, viz. Baruch, chaps. iii. 9-37, and iv.; the Song of the Three, v. 29 to 68; and the Prayer of Manasses. The two former are arranged stichometrically in the Paragraph Bible, and the third is similarly treated in Grabe's Septuagint. In the new Apocrypha they all appear as mere prose. This interferes with the general symmetry of the work. In the 2nd Book of Esdras 'Enoch' is corrected to 'Behemoth' in chap. vi. 49, and the long passage on the torments of the wicked and the joys of the righteous is inserted in chap. vii. But it might have been a question whether the Apocalypse of Esdras should not be restored as a whole from the Oriental versions, and the two chapters prefixed to it, as well as those added at the end, would in that case form two separate treatises, being later than the books of the New Testament Canon. In chap. viii. 19 the inscription to the Prayer of Esdras is restored from the Latin manuscripts, 'initium verborum Esdræ priusquam assumeretur.' There are some valuable marginal references to the Syriac and Arabic

versions in other parts of the book.

The Revisers in their preface say that 'lists of the Greek readings—or, in 2 Esdras, the Latin readings—adopted by the Committees will shortly be published.' This list, when it appears, will doubtless be found 'helpful to the student,' whilst the translation will be 'acceptable to the general reader of the Apocrypha.'

LL2

w

al

el

\$6

de

of

Dr

be

as

lal

un

no

tha

and

lxv

wo

Cy

on

onl

gra

obta

orig

tion

Che

reac

mor

of '

as '

give

read

insp

land

hims

corre

and

the 1

helpe

we a

pass

on A

chap

Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. With an Appendix containing the undoubted portions of the two chief prophetic writers in a translation. By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Canon of Rochester. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1895.)

THE analytical commentary which Professor Chevne here presents to his readers is the natural development of his earlier attempts to grapple with the problems of Isaiah, and stands as the most advanced book on the subject which has yet seen the light, not excluding the boldly conceived synthetic commentary of Bernhard Duhm. It is full of original work, and bears marks on every page of patient toil. The labour has been wedged in between academical duties at Oxford and ecclesiastical functions at Rochester, and has been impeded by an infirmity of sight, which all scholars will deplore (pp. vii, viii). Although the Professor writes for critical readers in the first place, vet in a prelude 'to the reader' he addresses himself specially to preachers in some straightforward remarks, because they have not yet shown nearly sufficient willingness to learn from the critics,' who in their turn have given way to a 'misplaced hesitancy.' He wants to see 'a more courageous attitude taken up towards ecclesiastical prejudice,' an assimilation of the main results of modern researches on the part of preachers, and an attempt made with due caution to allow their congregations to share in the benefit. This would lead, Professor Cheyne thinks, to no injury to true edification, but to a more intelligent view of the development of the higher life and thought of the Israelites, and to an acquaintance with a criticism 'which would make credible what without it might well appear a beautiful but scarcely credible fairy tale.' This is a fair proposal, and we will look at it from the preacher's point of view, somewhat enlarging the term preacher, so as to include all pastoral work, and bearing in mind the caution which, in alluding to Kuenen, Professor Chevne gives about the undesirability of rejecting a non-theological work of a great critic because of his limitations as a theologian.

At present the clergy of the Church of England practically set to work in the execution of their pastoral office on the traditional lines of the interpretation of Isaiah. They have 'read the Fathers,' and have found them in agreement with the Jewish tradition, with the apparent use of Isaiah in the New Testament by our Lord Himself and His apostles, and with the view in which all older clergymen among us were brought up. They know that the writings of St. Justin Martyr are full of expository allusions to all parts of Isaiah, and that these allusions, as in the case of the dialogue with Trypho, serve a valuable apologetic purpose. They find very precious passages for the best homiletical uses in the commentaries on Isaiah by St. Jerome and St. Cyril of Alexandria, and in a less degree by Theodoret, in the fragments of St. Chrysostom on the first eight and St. Basil on the first sixteen chapters. The deepest religious thoughts of their flocks on Christmas Day, on Good Friday, and on

n.

ng

a

iel

nd

n-

nts

to

ed

t is oil.

by

ace,

y to

not

ants

tical

ches in to lead,

to a

and

cism ear a

osal,

what , and

essor

ogical

ly set

tional

thers,

ith the imself

gymen

of St.

Isaiah.

rypho,

recious

Isaiah

gree by

t eight

and on

Whitsunday are closely bound up with the book of Isaiah as one whole, and the national mind is reflected in such passages of the national literature as Burns's line in his Cottar's Saturday Night about 'rapt Isaiah's wild seraphic fire,' and Isaac Walton's comment in the Compleat Angler on the prophet's style as 'high, glorious, eloquent.' Now there is nothing critical about this in the modern sense of that term. But the common Christian application of the grand whole is undoubtedly the popular conception of the book, and Professor Cheyne invites preachers to adopt a more excellent way of devout but honest Biblical preaching, with a view to the dissipation of uncritical views. A few cases will show what the Professor proposes as suitable matter for the pulpit. We are looking at the book, be it observed, simply from the plain preacher's point of view, as we are invited to do, learned criticism and tokens of patient labour apart, and without troubling ourselves about the question of unity, though we notice in passing that the theory of two Isaiahs is now regarded as 'a strange caricature of the old critical view' (p. ix), that a Trito-Isaiah and a school of followers have now been suggested (pp. xxxi, 341), that 'the critical value of the tradition of the Jewish and the Christian Church relative to the authorship of 'chaps. xl.lxvi. is 'none whatever' (p. 239), and that they contain 'one of the worst written passages (lii. 3-6) in the Old Testament' (p. 303).

Let us suppose that a preacher puts aside his Jerome and his Cyril and goes to Professor Cheyne for help for a Christmas sermon on 'Nevertheless the dimness.' What help will he find? We can only reply, in the Professor's own words, 'None whatever.' We have carefully read his comments upon what he very justly terms 'the grandest of Messianic prophecies' (p. 42), and as the net result we obtain six arguments from the subject matter and a string of linguistic difficulties to show that the passage is not of Isaianic origin. There is nothing at all to help a preacher on the Incarnation, and a Christian interpretation has to be brought to Professor Cheyne's exposition, instead of Professor Cheyne presenting the reader with a Christian interpretation. Nor do we find anything more helpful for the evening of Christmas Day in the interpretation of 'Behold a Virgin.' Immanuel, we are told, is merely to be taken as 'the name which mothers will before long by a kind of inspiration give to their newly born babes' (p. 33). This may seem to the reader to be a ridiculous interpretation in view of St. Matthew's inspired use of the passage (i. 23) and Isaiah's own phrase, 'Thy land, O Immanuel,' in viii. 8; but Professor Cheyne does not trouble himself to allude to St. Matthew at all in this connexion, and by two corrections in the Hebrew text of viii. 8 he avoids all inconsistencies and translates, 'And his outstretched wings shall fill the breadth of the land. For with us is God' (p. 396). Is the poor preacher really helped by this exposition? We are not thinking of the higher critic; we are confining ourselves to the preacher's needs. Again, let us pass to Good Friday. The sound old-fashioned Good Friday sermons on Abraham's sacrifice, the Psalms of the Passion, and the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah have nowadays been somewhat crowded out by the

H

Ti

for

wh

Th

Of

be

ref

and

rev

spe

bec

If

WO

pre

say

An

acc

oth

one

Jeh upo

exig

gro

to r

whe

fath

were

unse

reas

man

sin;

sacra

popular addresses of the Three Hours' Service. But there are still sermons preached on the Christian interpretation of Old Testament prophecy, and we turn again for help to Professor Cheyne's work. His view of the 'Servant passages' is new to us. It is possible, he thinks, that 'this cycle of poems' once had 'a separate existence,' and in particular that it is 'in the highest degree probable that lii. 13-liii, 12 was inserted by II. Isaiah from some other work' (p. 305). We are far from convinced by the arguments adduced (p. 307) for this suggestion, and when we have waded through a criticism of Duhm's reasons for making the Servant passages post-Exilic and denying them even to II. Isaiah, we find that we have reached the end of the section without so much as an allusion to the Passion or the Crucifixion. Is this Christian interpretation? Does it help the preacher? Do we not get more assistance after all from St. Peter (1 St. Peter ii. 19-25), with the added certainty that he was an inspired commentator? Professor Cheyne brings these reflexions upon himself by appealing specially to preachers. We make no uncertain answer to his invitation. We believe his critical analysis and his learned notes about dates and style and authorship to be by themselves the most unmixed chaff for purposes of Christian preaching that was ever offered to clergymen. It is not necessary to enlarge upon the further passages which we have examined; but we can assure our readers that if they go to Professor Cheyne's book, on the Feast of the Epiphany, on Whitsunday, and on Trinity Sunday, for teaching on great evangelical truths and on the catholic conception of the Kingdom of God, they will find no more help than we have indicated. They will find materials, not for the pulpit, but for the lecture-room. They will reflect that the very life of prophecy is to bear witness to Jesus (Rev. xix. 10). They will turn away from the dry bones of commentaries which leave out all that makes the prophecies a Christian study, and they will go for help to quarters where the first place is given to the New Testament explanation of prophecy.

'Still from father to son,
As the days went by of old,
The whisper was handed down,
The story of hope was told:
And patriarchs, one by one,
In the word of their God grew bold,
And the evening was tinged with gold.

'For the prophets' sainted choir
Passed o'er the world's dark rim,
And sang the nations' Desire,
And how men mourned for Him—
Haggai's clear-voiced lyre,
Isaiah's battle-hymn
And mystic Daniel's dream,'

XUM

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> From the Italian of Manzoni, Monthly Packet, vii. 326.

an.

till

ent

ork.

he

ind

are

this

m's

nem

the uci-

ner?

eter

om-

swer

rned

the

was

the

st of

hing

oom.

ss to

es of

first

History of Religion. A Sketch of Primitive Religious Beliefs and Practices, and of the Origin and Character of the Great Systems. By Allan Menzies, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of St. Andrews. (London: John Murray, 1895.)

This 'Sketch,' though replete with learning and full of valuable information respecting the great religious systems of the world, is not attractive in style, and is not likely to interest the ordinary reader, while it may serve usefully as a book of reference for the student. The writing is heavy, and the facts are piled so closely one upon another that the general view of the whole subject is obscured. Often at the end of a chapter the excellent remarks upon what has been said are overweighted by the mass of details to which they refer. This criticism applies more particularly to Parts II., III., and IV., where the several forms of national religion are under review; but in Parts I. and V. there is less of detail and more generalization.

The study of comparative religion, however interesting to the specialist, is not to be encouraged wholesale among ordinary readers, because the tendency of the study is to create distrust of all religion. If Christianity is to be viewed in the light of the religions of the world, especially under such an inadequate form as Professor Menzies presents it in chapter xxii., it is likely that the ordinary person would say that more was to be said for Buddhism than for Christianity. And if the religion of Israel is to be judged from the perverted account given of it in chapter xii., it is probable that Islam or some other creed would rank higher. Indeed, these two chapters make one feel that the Professor does not admit the real existence of Jehovah as the God of Israel, and does not allow that Christ came upon earth to found a great visible society, the Church. The exigencies of Dr. Menzies's preconceived notions respecting the growth of religion in the world (vide Part I.) compel him to bring the religion of Israel into line with that of Egypt or of Babylon, and to represent the religion of Christ as a vague and shadowy system, whereby man stands, indeed, in relation to God as a child to his father, but without the necessity of the Incarnation. If this book

unsettling to the faith of a weak brother, and that for the following reasons, viz.—

(1) It ignores the possibility of an original revelation from God to

were more attractive in style and subject-matter, we think it might be

- (2) It rejects the doctrine of the Fall;
- (3) It perverts the Biblical theory of sacrifice as the remedy for sin;
  - (4) It makes no allusion to the Divine Sonship of Christ;
- (5) It regards the Christian Church, the priesthood, and the sacraments as a later development of Christ's religion;
- (6) It denies to Christianity the purpose of a universal religion so far as Christ's own teaching went.
  - These are not the only objections which might be alleged against

L

fc

be

bu

hi

T

su

me

th

th

SO

for

WC

alr

fes

Ch

im

tha

Pre

fro

COL

acc

goo

bu!

mu

Hi

this book; but they are sufficient to show how misleading an account of the Jewish and Christian religions had to be manufactured in order to make them square with hypotheses about the growth of religion which have been built upon the study of heathen systems. But, that we may not be thought to exaggerate the charges against the book, the following references are given in support of them, viz.—

(1) Religion is defined to be 'the worship of higher powers' (p. 7) and 'the worship of unseen powers from a sense of need' (p. 10), and is shown to be dependent upon the progress of civilization for its development (p. 13). The argument of chapter i. is that men have invented gods for themselves as the need of them has been felt, and in the more civilized ages these gods have become higher conceptions—not real existences, but ideas gradually assuming a concrete form. The Jehovah of Israel is accounted for in the same way, apparently, in chapter xii.

(2) We are told that

'the theory that man was originally civilised and humane, and that it was by a fall, by a degeneration from that earliest condition, that the state of savagery made its appearance, is now generally abandoned '(pp. 16, 17). 'It is practically agreed that religion, the belief in and worship of gods, is universal at the savage stage. . . How did it get there? . . . It has been ascribed to a primitive revelation. . . . It is impossible, however, to conceive how this could be done. . . But how could all mankind forget a pure religion? . . The history of early civilization is the history of a struggle in which man has everything to conquer, and in which he is not remembering something he had lost, but advancing by new routes to a land he never reached before. And if civilization was won for the first time, so was religion '(p. 23).

We are quite content to be thought old-fashioned for upholding the Christian belief in an original revelation to mankind and the reality of the Fall.

(3) As regards sacrifice Mr. Robertson Smith may, of course, be right in maintaining that the earliest notion of it was a kind of communion feast for the man and his god (p. 68), but if once we admit the fact of sin and separation from God to enter into the worshipper's mind, we must acknowledge the necessity of some propitiation by sacrifice; and it has not yet been shown that consciousness of sin is wholly absent from primitive religion. The Biblical theory of sacrifice is that man was taught by God to cover his sin by the sacrifice of a beast, and it was through Cain's neglect to make propitiation for sin that he lost the divine blessing (Genesis iv. 7).

(4) The single chapter upon Christianity, as we have said above, gives a wholly insufficient account of it. There is not an indication of who 'Iesus' is, nor an allusion to the Incarnation as such.

'The relation between God and man is made purely moral.' 'Man is assured of the sympathy of this great God, and is then left in freedom as to the mode in which he should serve Him. No rules are prescribed.... Prayer is necessary. Further than this, the forms of the religious life are not prescribed.' 'The appearance of such a religion forms the most momentous epoch of human history. He who brought it forward must occupy a unique position in the estimation of mankind' (pp. 412-415).

Jan.

ount

d in

h of

ems.

iz.-

vers'

eed' iliza-

that

n has

come

ming

the

t was

, 17).

gods,

It has vever, nkind istory

he is

tes to

e first

g the

eality

se, be

com-

admit

pper's

on by

sin is

ry of

by the

e pro-

above,

cation

Man is

lom as

ed. . . .

ife are

most

d must

115).

We can only suppose that the writer is a Unitarian, and therefore his account of Christianity is watered down to a system of morals. There is no idea in it of a living and Divine Christ.

(5) One quotation will be enough here :-

'It was towards the end of the second century that the alliance between Christianity and the Greek world was finally ratified. Till then belief and practice were determined mainly by custom and tradition; but now these were to give way to definite laws and settled institutions. There came to full development, about the period we have mentioned, a highly organised system of Church government, a canon of sacred books of Christian origin, and a creed in which the beliefs of Christians were drawn together in one statement' (p. 421).

It will be seen that the Professor ignores the evidence of the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers as to the organization and institutions of the Church, and prefers the teaching of the Tübingen school.

(6) As regards the universalism of Christ's religion we read to our surprise, and we note the significant absence of capital letters:

'Jesus himself did not expressly say that his religion was for all men. It was his immediate aim to bring about the renewal of the faith of his countrymen, and to give it a more spiritual character; and some of his followers considered that he had aimed at nothing more than this. But he formed a circle of disciples and adherents, which afterwards came to be the Christian Church, and he attached no ritual condition whatever, to membership in that community' (p. 418).

We wonder if the Professor ever read St. Matthew xxviii. 19 and St. Mark xvi. 16, to say nothing of St. John iii. 3-5; we should have thought the universal design of the Gospel and the terms of membership were clear enough in these passages.

We expect, of course, after this to find Dr. Menzies adopting the so-called 'higher criticism' of the Old Testament in its most extreme form (pp. 175-6), and arguing in a circle about the early religion of Israel from writings which he has already condemned for untrustworthiness as belonging to a later age. This kind of treatment has already been admirably exposed in the *Baird Lecture* (1889) of Pro-

fessor J. Robertson, of Glasgow. We have spent our time in showing up the weak points of the account which Professor Menzies has given of the Israelite and Christian religions, because right views about them are so much more important than about any other religion; but we are bound to say that those who have not read The Sacred Books of the East (Clarendon Press), or the series of Non-Christian Religious Systems, published from time to time by the S.P.C.K., will find in this volume a useful compendium of facts for purposes of comparative study. accounts of the Greek and the Roman religions are particularly good; so is that of Buddhism, and that of the Chinese religions; but we are disposed to think that the late Archdeacon Hardwick's Christ and other Masters, if not quite up to date in some things, is a much more attractive and interesting book on the whole subject, and it does not diminish aught of the essence of Christianity as the History of Religion does.

di

M

pri

kn

fro

SCI

of

Fr

tin

of

Pr

bu

are

Ale

res

fou

me

to

Dr

of o

her

dis

tro

ma

sen

wea

We

Sto

our

write We Jus

the

adn

tabl

tion

If t

take

bec

Fur

(on

may

ing

adn

Lights and Shadows of Church Life. By John Stoughton, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895.)

It is not apparent for whose benefit these sketches of Church history were made; if for the theological student, they are too scrappy, and too full of blunders, and characterized by too much prejudice against the historic Church; if for the general reader, who does not want to enter into details, while they are certainly readable and contain much that is thoughtfully and interestingly written, they are misleading by the lack of proportion given to the several subjects and their exaggeration of defects. The general reader would gather that Church life had more 'shadows' than 'lights,' and would imagine that all the objections which a modern Nonconformist might bring against the Church now were anticipated in the first centuries, and that the visible Church was corrupt from the beginning, while its character was only to be redeemed by the few great and noble leaders who formed an 'invisible Church,' or 'a Church within the Churches' (pp. 376-7). The spirit of the writer appears from the following passages in his preface:-

'My intention has been to present certain salient points in the constitution and proceedings of early Christendom, rather than to cover the whole ground which belongs to what is called "a history of the Church" (p. vi).

'Christendom and Christianity are not the same. Christianity pure and simple is the source of real goodness; but Christendom produces what is no part of Christianity' (p. vii).

'The rise and progress of innovations in beliefs and practice it is our duty to trace to their real sources' (p. vii).

The writer pleads for our consideration of his great age and imperfection of sight; but we must say that we have found an unnecessary number of mistakes in spelling and in dates-e.g. the Nicene Council is dated 323 (pp. 136 and 140); Theodosius's reign is given as 527-562 (p. 151), and wrongly again as 375 (p. 234). We have also 'Hiæropolis' for Hierapolis (p. 145), 'Haddon and Stubbs' (p. 326), 'Berinus' (p. 337); but there can be no excuse for such a statement as the following: 'The historian Eusebius . . . was Bishop of Cæsarea' [Cappadocia]. 'He was succeeded by Basil' (p. 199). Unfortunately Dr. Stoughton has many such errors and confusions, which go to prove that he is not at home in ecclesiastical history. Not even a beginner would venture to identify Cæsarea in Palestine, which was Eusebius's see, with Neo-Cæsarea in Cappadocia, which was Basil's. Like many other writers Dr. Stoughton ignores the missions of the Eastern Church (p. 358), being apparently oblivious of the extraordinary zeal of the Nestorians, whose missionaries reached as far eastwards as China. So, again, he shows great ignorance of the conditions of the planting of the Church in Britain; and though he quotes Bede he has not read him to much purpose if he can call Dean Stanley's account of Augustine's preaching before King Ethelbert an 'imaginary sketch' (p. 328), for it is taken almost wholly from Bede's narrative. And what can one say of a writer who declares 'that while Canterbury was converted by a missionary

direct from Rome, Wessex was converted by Berinus (sic) from North Italy, East Anglia by a Burgundian priest, Northumbria and Mercia by missionaries from Ireland, 'Essex and Sussex ... by Saxon priests, Chad and Wilfrid'? Dr. Stoughton does not appear to know that Birinus certainly, and Felix probably, held a commission from the Pope, while the 'missionaries from Ireland' should be described as 'from Iona;' and Chad was the apostle of Mercia, Cedd of Essex; and Wilfrid, though an Englishman, received his orders in France, and was the most zealous partisan of the Roman see in those times. Nor can we agree with Dr. Stoughton's estimate of St. Martin of Tours and St. Ambrose, that they interposed on behalf of the Priscillianists, 'not from sympathy, or from a policy of toleration, but from opposition to secular interference' (pp. 153, 231); and we are sorry to find that he has such a bad opinion of St. Cyril of Alexandria (p. 215), and considers Pope Gregory the Great to be responsible for the great advance in the supremacy of the Roman see (pp. 248-9). 'He may be counted' (says Dr. Stoughton) 'chief founder of the popedom' (p. 349). But the number of such statements which we might take exception to and overthrow by reference to trustworthy authorities is almost endless. To speak more generally, Dr. Stoughton shows us that he does not understand the real purpose of ecclesiastical history, has not studied the original authorities, does not appreciate the importance of upholding the orthodox faith against heresy, has an inveterate hatred of episcopacy (pt. i. ch. iii. and p. 138), dislikes asceticism (pp. 83-5) and monasticism (pt. ii. ch. xii.), patronizes the Fathers (pp. 58, 62-3, 183, 209), but admires the martyrs (pp. 115-26), and thinks that the Councils were not representative of the whole Church (p. 177), and that their decisions were weakened by the behaviour of those who attended them (pp. 171-3). We will conclude with a few extracts which will show what Dr. Stoughton thinks about (1) Liturgical worship, (2) the doctrine of our Lord's Person.

 (1) 'Of public worship but little can be gathered from patristic writings' (p. 280; cp. p. 34).

We doubt from this statement whether the writer has ever studied Justin Martyr's account of the Sunday service.

'A basilican plan, with an altar in advance of the eastern wall, and the bishop's seat behind, still, if I rightly remember, indicates that an administrator of the Holy Supper did not officiate in the front of the table, but behind, not with back, but with face towards the congregation' (p. 281).

If the writer has been at Mainz he must have seen the same position taken every day at Mass; but the congregation is behind the celebrant, because the Chapter has seats behind the altar as well as the Bishop. Further on he says, 'Liturgies are of early date' (p. 281), having (on pp. 34, 35) doubted Bingham's and Palmer's statement that they may be traced back to the third century; and it is somewhat surprising to be told that 'in the time of Justin Martyr the Holy Supper was administered in accordance with' the Gospel account of the institution

D.D.

Jan.

too uch who able tten, veral

ader

and mist first ning, and ithin

from

conr the the

luces '

ssary uncil 527– also 326), ment op of 199).

story.
estine,
which
es the
ivious
ached

nce of hough in call Ethelwholly who

ionary

R

fol

the

an

of

the

or

the

me

log

of

tw

the

ea

Tr

Al

be

of

an Tr

M

ap

po

tro

tiv

Le

(I) wh

ba

an

De

un wh

of

Sy

dif

Re

aga

po

wh

in gre

inc

Sc

rea

of it. We feel pretty sure that the writer has not studied Justin's account, for otherwise he must have seen that we have there all the elements of the primitive Liturgy, together with the mixed chalice and the reservation of the Sacrament for the sick; but he has quietly ignored Justin's evidence as to Christian worship.

(2) 'When we find the Virgin Mary called "Mother of God," we cannot be surprised at the mariolatry which followed' (p. 166). 'It is easier to condemn Nestorius on the one hand, and Cyril on the other, for language they employed in this controversy, than to form an adequate theory respecting the union of Divinity and humanity in Christ' (p. 170).

It is clear that Dr. Stoughton does not see the importance of the word *Theotokos* as a safeguard of the doctrine of Christ's Divine Personality; he regards it as intended to do honour to the Virgin Mother, whereas the Catholic Church has always regarded it as showing that the Divine Personality took human nature into union with Itself. If the writer would study Hooker's series of chapters (l.-lvii.) in the fifth book of his *Ecclestastical Polity*, he would find that Hooker has a very clear notion of the nature of the Hypostatic Union.

We should like to say much more, because in nearly every chapter we found points which demanded correction; and if we have been severe it is because such a book, while being readable, and in some ways attractive and original, might fall into the hands of those who, from ignorance of the history of the Church in the first six centuries, would form wrong judgments about the state of Christendom. At the same time we are glad to commend the account given of St. Augustine's theology (pt. ii. ch. viii.), and the careful tracing of the causes which led to the separation of the East from the West (pt. ii. ch. xiii.)

The Church in France. By RICHARD TRAVERS SMITH, D.D., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, and Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin. With Maps. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co. No date.)

The impression made by this book, as by others belonging to the series of *The National Churches*, is that an attempt has been made to get too much into the space allowed. Consequently the mass of details presented interferes with the enjoyment of the history, and the reader is distracted with unimportant facts as the writer passes hastily from point to point, and there is no opportunity of digesting the principles which are suggested by the way. It would have been more enjoyable if *The Church in France* had not been broken up into so many separate chapters, but had been treated in longer periods, and with the excision of a great deal of unnecessary matter which only burdens the memory. If, for example, the substance of the several chapters had been grouped somewhat in this way—viz. i.—iii. Roman Gaul, iv.—vi. Early Kings, vii.—xi. Struggles with the Papacy, xii.—xv. The Reformation Period, xvi.—xx. The Catholic

stin's ll the nalice uietly

Jan.

," we . 'It n the rm an ity in

of the Divine Virgin it as union apters I find ostatic

hapter been some who, turies, a. At of St. of the (pt. ii.

D.D., Oublin.

to the ade to hass of cy, and passes gesting e been ken up longer matter ance of y—viz. ith the catholic

Revival, xxi.-xxiii. The Last Century—it would have been easier to follow the line of thought, which is now given piecemeal. And by the present arrangement the book is made still more difficult to read and less valuable as a book of reference by the very scanty allowance of dates. One learns only by accident where one is. Here and there a date is given, but otherwise a chapter may comprise a century or two, or perhaps only a few years, and there is no indication, even in the heading of the chapter, where it begins and ends. We have one more thing to find fault with, and that is the absence of any chronological table showing the secular history of France and the succession of the Papacy in parallel columns; this would have relieved the pages of a great amount of unnecessary detail. We are grateful for the two maps, and for a fairly good index, but we regret that the limits of the book did not admit of any account of the crusades or of the early Jesuit missions.

With these exceptions we have nothing but commendation for Dr. Travers Smith's work; he has followed chiefly the great work of the Abbé Guettée in twelve volumes, an unexceptionable authority, because his work was placed upon the Roman Index, not for its lack of truthfulness, but for its plain-spoken exposure of the Papal system, and the author was compelled to join the Greek communion. Dr. Travers Smith refers constantly to other authorities—e.g. Jervis, Martin, Michelet, Taine, and Maret. The great merits of his book appear to be (1) the clear exposition of the growth of the Papal power, (2) the intelligent grasp of doctrinal points in matters of controversy, (3) the careful distinction between principles of Church policy, e.g. Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, and (4) the appreciative memoirs of the great saints and divines who influenced the course of events in the several periods of French Church history. Let us illustrate these points by some references to the book itself. (1) The beginning of the temporal power of the Pope is shown to be when Pepin, at the invitation of Pope Stephen, subdued the Lombards and 'endowed the Roman See with the exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis' (p. 97). The first production of the Forged Decretals was when Hincmar opposed the Pope in the case of his unruly suffragan, the Bishop of Soissons. 'The cause was hopeless when once the Pope had added to his other advantages the authority of the Forged Decretals' (pp. 124-5). The first French pope was Sylvester II., who 'first of all men raised the cry of a crusade,' a very different character as pope from what he had been as Archbishop of Reims; for Gerbert, who had been a champion of the French Church against the Papal claims, could afterwards write, 'Peter possesses a power which no other upon earth equals' (pp. 133-4). Chapter x., which relates the history of the seventy years' residence of the popes in France, while it shows how the University of Paris was making great intellectual strides, yet presents a sad picture of the internal condition of the French Church, viz. pluralities, non-residence, incompetence of clergy, abuses of Papal nominations, ignorance of Scripture, and the rise of heresy. The whole chapter is well worth reading. Dr. Travers Smith points out how in earlier times 'the

S

F

tl

n

c

th

E

C

cl

R

th

th

ar

th

m

W

an

ye

lit hi A

re

in

tai

mi K

Th

rea

Le

sec

mendicants were the army of the Pope' (p. 193), the Dominicans being the agents of the Inquisition against the unfortunate Albigenses; and in the later chapters the influence of the Jesuits is shown to have been very powerful on the same side against the Protestants and Jansenists. But the following passages will show what the writer thinks of the Papacy in the ninth and nineteenth centuries respectively:—

'The crowning example of spiritual self-assertion in Europe was the power of the Pope, which, like the rest, advanced not by the force of either pure spirit or mere worldliness, but by a mixture of both. It was necessary that the representative of ecclesiastical power should silence the competing claims of his clerical brethren. In the age of which we are now treating, Rome is engaged in subduing rival ecclesiastics. The time has not arrived for her, in the character of undisputed head of the clerical power, to try conclusions with secular authority. For the present the Papal contests with kings are for moral ends, and have all our sympathy' (pp. 123-4).

But in reference to the Concordat of 1801 we read-

'The throne and the altar were so united in their thought, that they could not tolerate submission to a republican government. No doubt the Constitutionals had accepted many things inconsistent with the spiritual claims of Rome, as well as with the ancient secular privileges of their Church. Still, if Rome in 1794 had severed herself from political preference as she has done in 1892, and allowed her children to accept the government which the nation desired, the fate of the Church in France might possibly have been different. She might have been free and national; her bishops might not have been chosen for her by unbelieving rulers, or have made her the instrument of a selfish despot's ambition, and free offerings might have enabled her, as they have enabled so many denominations in various lands, much poorer than France, to dispense with a pittance from the State' (pp. 442).

(2) Chapter vi. is a good illustration of doctrinal points intelligently grasped, for we have here the controversy respecting the Real Presence in the Eucharist, associated with the names of Paschasius, Ratramn, and Rabanus Maurus, and the question concerning Predestination connected with Godescalk. But these are not nearly all, for the Jansenist troubles and the Bull Unigenitus are fully explained (chs. xvii.-xx.); and the Albigenses are carefully distinguished from the Waldenses in ch. ix., and the position of the latter is made clear (pp. 260-2). (3) 'Gallicanism in the extreme and secular form which recognises the superiority of the royal power to the ecclesiastical, even in things spiritual,' is illustrated by a speech of Des Ursins at a general assembly in Paris (ch. xi.), and the four famous articles passed by the clergy of France in 1682, under the influence of Bossuet, are called 'the watchword of the Gallican liberties' (pp. 380-1). We have also abundant illustrations of the relations of French kings to the affairs of the Church, especially in the appointments to bishoprics (chs. iv. v.), and the account of Charlemagne's relations to the Church is particularly good (pp. 99-110). (4) We feel sure by the sympathetic way in which Dr. Travers Smith

nicans enses; have s and writer espec-

Jan.

as the orce of It was silence ich we The of the oresent all our

at they o doubt ith the eges of solitical accept France and na-elieving abition, o many ispense

ligently al Prechasius, ng Prearly all, plained ed from de clear which iastical, ins at a articles ence of es' (pp. tions of appointmagne's (4) We Smith writes of certain great saints and divines of the French Church, that he has a real affection for them, not merely for what they did, but also for what they were; and wherever that is so the reader is bound to be interested. The characters which we should select as particularly well treated are St. Hilary of Poitiers and St. Martin of Tours, St. Bernard of Cluny (who occupies nearly the whole of chapter viii.), Gerson as a reformer at Constance (pp. 232-4), Arnauld of Port Royal, Bossuet and Fénelon, Lacordaire and Montalembert. Of the last two the writer says, 'They were noble-minded and devoted men.' 'The very reason why we admire so intensely the religious character of these two saintly men is that to the end of their lives they were faithful to those principles of liberty to the condemnation of which by the Pope they now adhered' (pp. 463-4). Fortunately English Churchmen are not required thus to sacrifice their liberty of conscience. The letter quoted in a note on p. 472 from an English chaplain is particularly interesting as an illustration of modern Romanism in France.

The Life and Times of John Kettlewell, with Details of the History of the Nonjurors. By the Author of Nicholas Ferrar, his Household and his Friends. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.)

IF there be any truth in the taunt cast in the teeth of English churchmen that their Church has no hagiology, the reason is certainly not that that Church has produced no saints. Another reason will be found in the notice of the 'Archbishop Laud Commemoration' (see infra, p. 528), and need not be repeated here. But the present volume reminds us that there have been true types of saintliness in the English Church bearing marked traces of the peculiar impress of that Church. John Kettlewell was an English churchman to the backbone; and we heartily thank the anonymous writer of this book for calling the attention of the public to a character which no one can study without spiritual profit. Some years ago he directed attention to another English saint, or rather a little knot of English saints, in a volume entitled Nicholas Ferrar, his Household and his Friends, which formed the subject of an Article in this Review. If we feel that a Short Notice rather than a long Article is the best way of dealing with the present volume, the reason is, not that John Kettlewell is at all inferior to Nicholas Ferrar in saintliness, but that the writer has not been able to draw so detailed and vivid a picture of the former as of the latter. In fact, he has told us little or nothing about John Kettlewell himself which we might not have discovered from the contemporary Life edited by Kettlewell's intimate friend, Francis Lee, but written to a great extent by his still more intimate friends, George Hickes and Robert Nelson. This is, however, no reason why the present volume should not have been published, for the public had ceased to read, if they ever did read very widely, the earlier Life; and they may, it is hoped, be induced to read the later. In the first place, it is much shorter; Lee's Life was too long, and too full of general reflexions. In the second place, it is more handy, in the literal sense of the term. The

ES

W

OU

IT

bis

ha

tru

WO

be gra

lea

bee

a fi

of a

lim

Car

of '

whi

con

pred

he l

shal

fam

ting

upo

Coll

scho

valu

siast

wand

was

instr

over

could

1581

Eliza

Engl

churc

Purit

press

neede

was, a

the n

electe

fessor VO

only form in which we have seen Lee's Life is in one of two large folio volumes, it being prefixed to Kettlewell's Complete Works, some of which it is vain to expect 'the general reader' to grapple with in these degenerate days. Once more, it is written 'in a language understanded of the people.' The quaint style of the seventeenth century is delightful to the student, but it is to a great extent 'caviare to the general.' Canon Carter, in his well-written 'Introduction,' rightly describes the volume before us as 'a history rather than a biography, though Kettlewell appears throughout as the central figure. We must confess that we should like to have seen 'the central figure' standing out rather more prominently, but we can well understand the difficulty of so painting the picture, when the main subject of it was one who always kept himself in the background, while the subordinate figures were such prominent men as Sancroft, Ken, and Lloyd (of Norwich, not of St. Asaph). The author, by the way, is quite right in insisting upon the fact that Lloyd was really the leader of the early nonjuring party: it is curious that it should have been so, seeing that many others (who are noticed more or less fully in this volume) come before us with a far more vivid and distinct personality; but the fact is indisputable. The general history of the times, which forms a large portion of the book, has been written by many pens, and, of late years, by several good churchmen's pens; but it has been so frequently and persistently misrepresented by others, that it was not at all superfluous for a true churchman again to repeat it. The general public has been so often told the story wrongly, that it requires the right version to be well hammered into its head by repeated blows; and we welcome this as another blow in the right direction. The dealer of the blow quotes largely the writings of Canon Overton, Mr. Lathbury, and other Church authors; but he makes ample acknowledgment of his indebtedness to them in his notes and references. His style is scholarly and finished, and his tone admirable. Though he shows plainly enough that he is a marked High Churchman, yet the most uncompromising Low Churchman or dissenter cannot fairly accuse him of ever being guilty of any breach of good taste or Christian charity.

We venture to point out in conclusion a few little slips which it would be well to correct in a future edition. The title of Robert Nelson's well-known work—by the way, we hope it is not true, as our author affirms, that it is now 'almost unknown' (p. 193)—is A Companion to the Festivals and Fasts, &c., not Fasts and Festivals, as it is commonly called, and as it is called in this book (p. 71 and elsewhere). The 'Festivals' come first, and occupy more than two-thirds of the whole work. The writer of the Life of Archibishop Sancroft spelt his name 'D'Oyly,' not 'D'Oyley' (p. 95 and passim). Dr. Lake was Bishop of Chichester, but never of Winchester (p. 127). The name of the excellent Archbishop of York was John Sharp, not Sharpe (p. 127). There are also a few printer's errors, such as Kettleworth for Kettlewell (p. 224), 1669 for 1689 (p. 239), repetite for repetita (p. 251), and 1631 for 1731 (p.269). It will be seen, however, that none of these little slips at all affect the real value of a book which

we hope to find widely read, and which we heartily recommend to our readers.

The Life and Times of James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh. By J. A. CARR, LL.D. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co., 1895.)

It was with some misgivings that we approached this volume. Archbishop Ussher might have been made a convenient peg on which to hang laudatory remarks about loose and colourless churchmanship, or about Orange protestantism of the violent type; and, if report be true, there are not wanting in the Irish Church perfervid spirits who would be glad of an opportunity of making such remarks. But we soon found that Dr. Carr was not of the number, and that it would be both a duty and a pleasure to commend very strongly his monograph to readers on this side the Channel. The most famous and learned man in a Church which, in spite of its chronic weakness, has been exceptionally fertile in famous and learned men, well deserved a fresh biography; for though there are several extant, they are not of a popular character—at any rate, they have been consigned to the limbo of oblivion, so far as the general reader is concerned. Carr is eminently qualified for the task he has undertaken; his sphere of work lies in the place where Ussher was born and educated, and which, in spite of the fact that his preferments lay elsewhere, still continued to be the centre of his influence. While thoroughly appreciating the unique learning, the piety, and the amiability of Ussher, he has too firm a grasp of Church principles not to see the temporary shakiness, at any rate, of those of his subject; he is thoroughly familiar with that branch of the Church of which Ussher was a distinguished ornament; and he can throw many interesting side-lights upon the Irish Church in general, and upon its first university, Trinity College, Dublin, in particular. His style is uniformly clear and scholarlike, and his tone admirable throughout. One of the most valuable parts of his book is that in which he vindicates the ecclesiastical policy of Laud and Strafford in Ireland; and he is not wandering from his proper subject when he discusses this, for Ussher was brought into close relationship with Laud, who was no doubt instrumental in raising his churchmanship. James Ussher had to overcome strong prejudices, derived from his early training, before he could become a consistent churchman. He was born in Dublin in 1581, and his education coincided with the later years of Queen That was a period when puritanism was rampant in The national England, and, of course, still more so in Ireland. churches of both countries were fast drifting into the position of Puritan sects. The foundation of a university at Dublin for the express purpose of strengthening the Church—a work which was sorely needed-intensified the Puritan feeling. For Trinity College, Dublin, was, at the outset, a nursery of puritanism. James Ussher entered the new college in 1593, being one of the very first batch of scholars elected there. He subsequently became a fellow, and the first protessor of divinity in the new university. In the latter half of the VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

XUM

large some ith in guage eenth aviare etion,' han a entral

Jan.

the in well main round, neroft, by the lly the d have as fully listinct of the

of the ten by pens; others, repeat ly, that ead by e right ings of but he

in his and his marked man or breach which it Robert as our A Com-

nd elsein twohbishop bassim). p. 127)arp, not Kettletitæ for owever,

k which

ls, as it

of

CO

CI

fo

Ph

(p.

wa

of

we

gu

Ja: Us

Bis

qu

COL

COL

tak

jec

beg

Arc

life

Us

bro tho Th

res

tog

and

disc

the

Chi

of t

in t

wen

Irisl

solid

Coll

first

been

pub

that

masi

Chu

amia

sche

thou

joine the a

sixteenth century the Irish Church was in a most unsatisfactory state. and its internal condition was aptly typified by its neglected and indeed ruined fabrics. 'The whole episcopal system,' writes Dr. Carr (p. 32), 'had broken down.' Some of the bishoprics were actually held by laymen; and the temporalities of one see (Killaloe) were given to a boy-student at Oxford, called O'Brien, in order to propitiate the powerful clan of the O'Briens. The members of the Church consisted almost exclusively of the English settlers in the eastern half of the country; in the western half the Church was hardly represented at all. The clergy themselves were, as a rule, only half It was absolutely necessary to fill the bishoprics with churchmen. English and Scotch settlers, for 'the supply of Irish bishops was not There was no university or college to educate them' forthcoming. (p. 36). On the other hand, the Roman Catholics were active in the highest degree. Ussher himself 'was surrounded by Roman Catholic relatives, who laid more than one trap to catch him' (p. 44); but he escaped, carrying with him the strongest aversion for everything savouring of Rome. For centuries the country had been left without the benefit of a national university, though many futile attempts had been made to found one. At last, mainly through the efforts of the Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Loftus) and the Archdeacon of Dublin (Henry Ussher, uncle of the future primate), 'the College of the Sacred and Undivided Trinity, near Dublin,' was established on a humble scale, 'the foundation-stone of the first building being laid by the Mayor of Dublin, Thomas Smith, March 19, 1592' (p. 59). A strong puritanical element prevailed in the new college from its commencement. Archbishop Loftus, its chief founder, was a Puritan; still more markedly so its first actual provost (Dr. Loftus took the nominal office for a while), Walter Travers, Hooker's opponent, who had actually refused to receive episcopal orders; and the next two provosts, Alvey and Temple, were of the same kidney. These influences should all be taken into account in estimating the early career of Ussher. Both by attraction and repulsion he was drifting into puritanism; but his theological studies, which were already very extensive, acted as an influence in another direction. He refused the provostship when it was offered him, lest it should prove 'a hindrance to his studies' (p. 76). But he became professor of divinity, and lectured, it need scarcely be said, most ably and learnedly against Romanism. In 1601 he was ordained by his uncle, the Archbishop of Armagh, being two years under the canonical age. He was required by the government to preach controversial sermons against Romanism, a task which he was probably not loth to perform. Ussher, like the churchmen of Ireland generally, was far more busy with destructive than with constructive work. He was armed at all points against Roman encroachments; but what had he to put in their place? He was protestant to the core; but 'protestant' is a negative term, and the only positive form which presented itself to him was puritanism, which did not at all commend itself to his intellect. Very early in life we find him objecting to certain things as 'flat puritanical' (p. 75). His first work (published 1613) was a sort

XUM

ry state, and inr. Carr actually e) were opitiate Church eastern rdly realy half ics with was not e them' e in the Catholic but he erything without pts had s of the Dublin e of the ed on a g laid by 59). A its com-Puritan; took the ent, who next two These inthe early s drifting eady very fused the indrance inity, and ly against chbishop e was rens against rm. But nore busy armed at to put in tant' is a d itself to his intelof continuation of Jewell's Apology, and was written in Latin; it was controversial and negative, only showing that there were always Christians who did not hold Roman errors. Space forbids us to follow in detail the course of Ussher's life. In 1614 he married Phoebe Challoner, 'with the result of forty years' happy wedded life' (p. 101). In 1615 the first Convocation of the Church of Ireland was held, at which Ussher took a leading part in drawing up articles of religion, 104 in number, for his native Church. These articles were of a markedly Calvinistic and Puritan type, and widened the gulf between the Protestants and Roman Catholics. But about 1618, in one of his visits to England, he became connected with King James I, who loved to have learned men about him, and made Ussher his chaplain in ordinary; and in 1621 he was consecrated Bishop of Meath, resigning his professorship. But he was still frequently at Dublin, and made several visits to England. He still continued to write and preach on subjects connected with the Roman controversy, appealing always to the judgment of antiquity, and taking as the motto of one of his most elaborate works on the subject (Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland), 'From the beginning it was not so.' In 1624 he was nominated by the king Archbishop of Armagh, and for the remaining sixteen years of his life held the primacy of the Irish Church. James died in 1625, but Ussher found equal favour with his successor; and we now find him brought into contact with the man who unquestionably affected, though he did not make him change entirely, his religious views. This was William Laud, then Bishop of London, who entered into a correspondence with Ussher on Irish matters. Laud and Ussher worked together in bringing about a much-needed reform of the Irish Church, and saving that Church from robbery. But, strange to say, Ussher discountenanced the attempts made, especially by Bedell, to introduce the native language of Ireland into the public worship of the Irish Church. The explanation, of course, is that he was 'a devoted friend of the English interest '(p. 215); he called preaching and catechizing in the Irish tongue 'a building of castles in the air;' and he actually went so far as to discountenance the idea of translating the Bible into Irish, for fear of weakening the English connexion. It was at Ussher's solicitation that Laud consented to become Chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin, and his emendation of the statutes was perhaps the first step which led to the success of a college which had not hitherto been very successful. The Religion of the Ancient Irish and British, published about 1630, though as Protestant as ever, seems to show that the influence of Laud had begun to affect Ussher. It is a masterly treatise against Roman mediævalism, but it lays great stress both on the catholicity and the antiquity of the faith of the Irish Church. We can scarcely trace the same influence in Ussher's amiable attempt to bring over the Presbyterians by the well-known scheme of 'a moderate episcopacy' which bears his name. He thought that 'episcopal and presbyterial government might be conjoined by means of synodical government;' and his plan met with the approval of moderate Nonconformists like Calamy and Reynolds,

things as

was a sort

h

SI

S

k

d

th

st

fl

N

p

I

th

B

aı

T

B

ar

th

m

br

at

L

im

so

ac

to

Fo

th

as

fic

civ

a l

Cł

M

an

pro

after the Restoration. But Ussher strongly vindicated the Church policy of Laud and Strafford in Ireland; and we are glad to learn that in his later years he changed his mind as to the desirableness of conducting public worship in the Irish tongue, and seconded the efforts of Bishop Bedell, which he had once opposed, in Convocation, The book by which Archbishop Ussher is now perhaps best known is The Antiquities of the British Churches, published in 1639; but the greatest of his many titles to the gratitude of theologians is undoubtedly his critical edition of St. Ignatius. 'To the critical genius of Ussher,' writes Bishop Lightfoot, 'belongs the honour of the true Ignatius.' For an account of the details of this great work we must refer the reader to the pages of Dr. Carr (pp. 312-21), as well as for a description of his other literary labours. The Archbishop suffered severely, like his friends in England, from 'the troubles.' He was driven from his see altogether; and one of the last episcopal appointments of the hapless Charles was that of the Irish Primate to the see of Carlisle, to hold in commendam. Ussher showed that he had thoroughly the courage of his opinions. In the summer of 1643 he not only refused to attend the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, but bravely preached against that Assembly as 'an illegal and schismatical meeting'—a most perilous thing to do. He was driven from pillar to post, and was reduced to great straits; but he remained a firm royalist, and was not detached from his allegiance by the overtures made, and indeed the real kindness shown, to him by Oliver But it is to Cromwell's credit that on the Archbishop's death in 1656 he required that a public funeral should be accorded to Ussher in Westminster Abbey. This was the only occasion on which the Burial Service of the Church of England was used in the Abbey during the Commonwealth. His life is a valuable study, among other reasons, as showing how wide and deep reading tends to draw a man from Puritan narrowness to the Catholic faith.

The Life of John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury. By R. J. WOODHOUSE, M.A. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.)

This biography need not detain us so long as that of Archbishop Ussher, though its subject is as important in its way. There is a singular interest, from a churchman's point of view, in that transition period, at the close of the fifteenth century, when the way was being prepared for the stirring events of the sixteenth; and in that period John Morton, Cardinal-Archbishop of Canterbury, was one of the most noteworthy figures. Morton is said, with no exaggeration, by his latest biographer, to have made the Tudor dynasty; and it was the Tudor dynasty that made the English Reformation possible, and gave it the shape which it took in this country. He was also a reformer himself in his way—that is, he strove to promote reforms by and within the Church itself, and was more or less in sympathy with the Renaissance movement. He was born at Milborne St. Andrew in Dorset, some say in 1420, others in 1410. The fact that he received his early education from the monks of Cerne Abbey no

Jan. Church o learn ness of ed the cation. known 9; but s is ungenius he true re must l as for suffered He was ppointthe see he had 1643 he minster, d schisen from ained a ne overy Oliver bishop's orded to n which e Abbey ng other

y R. J. nd Co.,

v a man

chbishop here is a cansition as being t period to fithe tion, by d it was ble, and s also a forms by thy with Andrew that he bbey no

doubt influenced his future character; but he probably never intended to become a monk himself, for he proceeded from Cerne to Balliol College, a secular foundation, instead of entering any of the many colleges which were in the hands of the regulars. At Oxford he highly distinguished himself, and, when he received holy orders, preferments were quickly showered upon him. In 1450 he was made sub-dean of Lincoln; in 1458 he received two prebends, one at Salisbury and the other at Lincoln, when he resigned the sub-deanery; he also held the living of Bloxworth in Dorset, and was generally known as 'the parson of Bloxworth.' Like many clergymen of his day, he practised law, and was a well-known advocate at Doctors' Commons in London. He was recommended by his predecessor in the see of Canterbury, Cardinal Bourchier, to the notice of King Henry VI., and became a member of the Privy Council. He was a staunch Lancastrian, and, after the Lancastrian defeat at Towton, he fled the country, and was attainted as a traitor. He attended Queen Margaret in her exile, but after a while made his peace with the ruling powers, and was Master of the Rolls in the reign of Edward IV. In 1479 he was consecrated Bishop of Ely, and in 1483 ministered to the King in his last illness. Soon followed the famous scene in the Bishop's town house, which has been immortalized by Shakespeare, and which ended in the imprisonment of Morton. His Oxford friends, among whom he had a high reputation, interceded for him, and Richard III. consented that he should be removed from the Tower and consigned to the custody of the Duke of Buckingham at Brecknock. If the exceedingly interesting conversations between Buckingham and his prisoner reported in Sir T. More's Richard III., and recorded in substance by Mr. Woodhouse (pp. 72-3), be correct, the future destiny of England was virtually decided by this imprisonment. At any rate, it is certain that Morton took a leading part in bringing over Henry, Earl of Richmond, to claim the throne; and, when the plan succeeded, Morton was at least as influential a person at court as he had been in the preceding reigns. Henry made him Lord High Chancellor, and, on the death of Cardinal Bourchier immediately afterwards, Archbishop of Canterbury; he also with some difficulty procured for him the cardinal's hat. Morton has acquired for himself some not undeserved odium by lending himself too readily to the extortionate measures of Henry VII. 'Morton's Fork' has passed into a proverb. But there is no reason to think that he was personally avaricious. On the contrary, he showed, both as Bishop of Ely and as Archbishop of Canterbury, very great munificence on several occasions. He was a strong and able ruler, both civil and ecclesiastical. He was, no doubt, more of a statesman and a lawyer than a clergyman, but he conciliated the respect of good Christian men. The high esteem in which he was held by Sir T. More, who was in his youth a retainer in the Archbishop's household, and who has immortalized him in his Utopia, is of itself a sufficient proof of this; and his own appreciation of real saintliness is shown by the persistent and successful effort he made to procure the tardy canonization of St. Anselm. He died, with the century, in 1500.

ev

th

dis

of an

or

rai

M

the

gro

he

ev

an

p.

ba

Deab

(p. Be

tha

kir

Mi

to ha

tha

he

Ba

to eld

dai

we

Ar

Тн

col sub hac

on

full

son

Turning from the subject of the present work to its execution, we must confess that it is rather a slight performance. Mr. Woodhouse is evidently not a practised writer; and, short as his work is, it is eked out with long quotations from Dean Hook—not always a very trustworthy authority—and from so very familiar a book as Mr. James Gairdner's History. There is also a good deal of obvious padding in the little volume. Still, we may thank the author for drawing attention to a man who was one of the foremost personages of his day—and that a very important and interesting day. There is also nothing objectionable in tone, style, or sentiment in the book, and that is saying something, when pernicious literature is only too abundant.

History of the Church Catholic. By A. H. HORE, M.A. (London: James Parker and Co., 1895.)

To write a history of the Church Catholic in a single volume would seem to be an almost impossible task; but Mr. Hore is quite aware of the difficulty, and anticipates any criticism that might be made upon his title in his Preface. 'A continuous history of the Catholic Church, comprised in one volume, is, it need scarcely be said, of an elementary character, intended for beginners; the present work is an attempt to give some knowledge on the subject, leaving it to others to give more.' We are afraid that a vast number of educated people really belong to the class of 'beginners' in the subject of Church history, and require a work of a distinctly elementary character. To such we heartily recommend the volume before us, which will certainly, as Mr. Hore modestly puts it, 'give them some knowledge' as to what the Church is, how it has grown up, and what a noble work it has done; while others, who would resent the imputation of being 'beginners,' might yet find many a useful hint in its pages. Mr. Hore has wisely confined himself to what may be termed the outer history of the Church, and has dwelt especially upon its relation, at various periods, to the civil powers. As his work is 'a further contribution to those already existing in the cause of Church defence,' this was of course only natural, assuming that the words 'Church defence' are used in their technical sense. But, apart from this, if he had entered at length upon the history of doctrine he could not possibly have executed his task, even in the most perfunctory manner, within the compass of a single volume. But, limiting himself as he has done, he has given us a most useful little book. Strong churchman as he is, he is yet scrupulously fair all round, doing the fullest justice to men with whom he evidently does not agree. One of his happiest arrangements—an arrangement which we do not remember to have seen in any other Church history of the kind-is his division of the work of the Reformation into three parts, each occupying a separate compartment in one chapter, which is rightly entitled 'The Three Reformations.' The first he calls 'The Protestant Reformation,' the second 'The Roman Catholic Reformation,' and the third 'The Catholic Reformation.' Of course the titles will be equally found fault with, by Roman Catholics on the one side and by Protestant Dissenters on the other; but the calm historian, what-

tion, we dhouse is, it is a very . James lding in g attens daynothing that is dant.

ondon:

e would e aware e made Catholic d, of an rk is an thers to people Church er. To vill ceredge 'as le work s. Mr. ne outer ation, at ner conlefence, Church this, if uld not functory ng him-Strong oing the

e. not rel—is his ch occurightly he Pro-

mation, itles will side and n, what-

ever his views may be, will admit as a mere matter of history that the three movements were separate movements, and should be carefully distinguished from one another. If words have any meaning, the third, which took place in England, intentionally differed from either of the other two. Unlike the first, it clung tenaciously to Catholicity and antiquity; unlike the second (which yet was a true re-formation, or the doings at the Council of Trent are unintelligible), it deliberately broke off from the Roman obedience. Of all the chapters in Mr. Hore's volume, the last, entitled 'The Three Reformations,' is the one which we would earnestly advise our readers to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest. Considering the enormous extent of ground which Mr. Hore covers, and the vast number of facts which he packs into his pages, he has made wonderfully few slips. But he evidently values accuracy so much that we are sure he would not thank us if we failed to call his attention to the few-the very few, and not very important-inaccuracies that have struck us in reading his pages. On p. 36 'Beræa' should surely be Bercea (Bépoua); on p. 40 'Sosthesnes' should be 'Sosthenes,' and on p. 63 'Blount' should be 'Blunt.' We know it is a moot point, but surely the balance of authorities is very overwhelming against the translation of Deus Fidius, 'a god in whom they believed' (p. 66); and is not 'the absence of any knowledge that such a king as Lucius ever existed' (p. 110) rather a sweeping statement in the face of both Nennius and Bede and the Liber Landavensis? We agree so far with Mr. Hore that King Lucius is a very doubtful being, but we could not quite ignore the authorities mentioned above. Again, the story of the kings Ethelbert and Sabert joining together to build the West Minster (p. 288) seems to us to rest on a very doubtful legend, and to be probably incorrect: the East Minster (that is, St. Paul's) would have been nearer the mark. Again, we cannot agree with Mr. Hore that Wiclif was ever a *fellow* of Balliol (p. 521); it is pretty sure that he was fellow of Merton, and quite sure that he was Master of Balliol. Finally, on p. 635, is it quite correct to say that Lady Jane Grey (or rather Dudley) was next in right of succession to the throne to Mary and Elizabeth? Had not the descendants of Henry VII.'s elder daughter, Margaret, a prior claim to those of his younger daughter Mary? It will be seen, however, that none of the points we have noted really affect the value of Mr. Hore's book.

Archbishop Laud Commemoration, 1895: Lectures on Archbishop Laud, together with a Bibliography of Laudian Literature and the Laudian Exhibition Catalogue, &c. Edited by W. E. COLLINS. (London: All Hallows, Barking, 1895.)

THE career of Archbishop Laud has lately been discussed in these columns at so great a length that it is unnecessary to dwell upon the subject generally, especially as the matter of this volume, so far as it had appeared in the report of the Guardian, formed one of the pegs on which our remarks were hung. But we heartily welcome this fuller account, for which, we frankly own, we had been waiting somewhat impatiently. We can now, however, quite understand the

le

SI

as

of

fa

to

CO

eı

be

m

to

sh

th

th

to

in

de

us

ge

ca

in

th

in

ot

dr

ar

tic

delay. The compiling of the bibliography, though the editor modestly owns that it may even yet be imperfect, must have been a work of great labour, and the drawing up of the very exhaustive index could have been no slight task. Of the five lectures only the first had appeared in print before, so the arrangement of them must have been a work of time; and the admirable Introduction was not written currente calamo. It was far better to do a work of this kind thoroughly, though at the expense of some delay, than to do it hastily and perfunctorily, and we congratulate the editor on the

satisfactory result of his labours.

The five lectures presuppose a general knowledge of Laud's life; those, therefore, who do not possess this knowledge, would do well first to read Mr. Hutton's excellent little monograph (we have already expressed our opinion that this is by far the most satisfactory of the many biographies) before attacking the commemoration volume. They will then be in a position to appreciate the estimate of Laud from five different points of view-as a churchman, as a statesman, as an educationist, as a controversialist, and as a pious Christian-which the volume contains, and which sufficiently cover the whole ground of Laud's many-sided life. We are very far indeed from thinking that the five lectures are all of equal value, but it is unnecessary to draw invidious comparisons between them. To one lecture, however, we must draw especial attention: the description of Laud as a statesman strikes us as being one of the most masterly productions. which have appeared on the subject. The whole work is curiously illustrative of the mind of the English Church. Those who read it, expecting to find in it simply the glorification of a saint or a hero, will assuredly be disappointed. English churchmen have always differed from Roman Catholics on the one hand, and from Protestant Dissenters on the other, in that they have been wont to recognize the weak as well as the strong points of their great champions. Hence the complaint that there is no hagiology in the English Church. But it is surely to the credit rather than to the discredit of that Church that there is not. Whatever we are, let us be honest; and so long as poor human nature continues to be what it is, there will always be imperfections in the best of characters. If you read biographies in the Lives of the Saints on the one hand, or in any Dissenting magazine on the other, you will find faultless beings as plentiful as blackberries. But you will not find them in real life, and it has ever been the tradition of the English Church to paint her sons as they were, not as they ought to have been. The various portraits of Laud which this volume contains are no exception to the rule; in fact, some may complain that the strong points in his character were not exclusively brought out, and a decent veil thrown over the weak ones on such an occasion. With such complaints we have no sympathy whatever. Truth will out, and if it had not been told by Laud's admirers it would certainly have been more than told by his adversaries. As it is, the objections to the commemoration, which, if we may judge from the specimens given in the Introduction, were extraordinarily virulent, are ludicrously out of place. Laud's

editor
been a
austive
nly the
m must
was not
is kind
do it
on the

Laud's ould do re have factory olume. f Laud man, as -which ground ninking sary to owever, d as a uctions uriously read it, a hero, always m Prowont to t chamin the to the e, let us be what ers. If and, or faultless them in nurch to ception ts in his thrown aints we

ot been n told by

duction,

Laud's

failings and mistakes are ruthlessly brought to light; indeed, the leading article reprinted from the Times—a newspaper which is not supposed to be over-biassed by ecclesiastical proclivities—gives quite as favourable a view of Laud as most of the lecturers do; and the general result is that we have in this volume a vivid description, not of a vapid angel, but of a human being, who, with all his faults and failings, was yet one of whom English churchmen may be proud—one to whom they owe a deep debt of gratitude for having done more perhaps than any other man, living or dead, towards making the Church of England what she is. Those who hate that Church may well hate Laud; but those who love her will cherish his memory as a sacred possession, and will cordially thank all those who have been concerned in the origination and the successful carrying out of the Laud Commemoration, and in the publication of this volume as an enduring record of the very interesting event.

Some Thoughts on Christian Reunion: being Seven Addresses given during his Visitation in June 1895. By W. BOYD CARPENTER, Bishop of Ripon. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

THESE addresses are, like all the works of their brilliant writer, beautifully expressed, full of apt illustrations and graceful metaphors, and garnished with quotations very much to the point. With a great part of their matter we cordially agree, and we especially admire the masterly way in which the Bishop, proving his different points up to the hilt by extracts from the early Fathers and later divines, shows that the papal claims of supremacy and infallibility are uncatholic as well as unreasonable, and must prove fatal barriers to that reunion which the Pope desires to see. But his remarks about the obstacles to reunion on the side of nonconformity appear to us to be painfully vague and unsatisfactory. Instead of boldly grasping his nettle, he plays with it and handles it delicately; and it is well if some of those who will naturally have listened with breathless interest to their Father in God, and will strive to follow his guidance, do not find that the nettle will sting them. Dropping metaphor, let us explain distinctly what we mean. We will recur presently to his general remarks about reunion, and show first how he shirks-we cannot use a milder word—the Nonconformist difficulty. Having devoted more than a hundred pages to grappling most powerfully with the Roman difficulty, he can only find room to touch slightly, in four pages at most, on the reunion of those who form in England the immense majority of those who stand aloof from us; and he introduces his very jejune remarks thus:

'There remain the various non-Episcopal communions. It would be outside my purpose to enter in detail into the conditions, favourable or otherwise, to Reunion which these bodies severally exhibit' (p. 215).

'Outside his purpose!' Why, are not these 'Visitation Addresses' delivered to parochial clergy, whose great difficulty in their several parishes is to know how to deal with those parishioners who are attached to 'non-Episcopal communions'? Surely for all practical purposes these clergy must far more need guidance in dealing

me

rat

Dr

giv

and

me

rec

mo

car

fee

me

and

alil

wo

tow

gre

wa

cle

ma

If o

pas

Th

ear

Bis

ins

0

sub

not

ak

An

and

to t

Bis

clea

Cha

race

(bra

(Se

us t

with that subject which their Bishop dismisses so curtly than with that which he treats so elaborately. For, to state the matter arithmetically, what we may term Genevan difficulties will be in proportion to Roman difficulties as ten to one to them, in the majority of cases. Indeed, very many will never be brought into collision with Rome, while every day they will be brought into collision with Geneva. But, whereas on the former the Bishop's trumpet gives no uncertain sound, on the latter it scarcely gives any sound at all, and what it does give is very uncertain indeed. In fact, we are driven back to his general utterances at the beginning of the book in order to gain even a faint inkling of what he would have us to do. He there impresses upon us several times that 'unity, not uniformity,' is the thing to be aimed at. We have no objection to the dictum in itself; in fact, it expresses something very like a truism: for who, in his senses, could ever suppose that one form of worship is to be insisted on throughout Christendom? But we have rather a prejudice against the phraseology, because it is that which, in our experience, is always used when men wish to tell us that there is no real difference between Church and Dissent. At any rate, it would have been well if the Bishop had defined a little more clearly what he means by 'unity' as opposed to 'uniformity.' From several passages one might gather (though we do not believe the Bishop intended it) that 'unity' may be had without definite teaching on the faith once for all delivered unto the saints. 'A vast toleration in matters of ritual and ceremony, and even in matters of teaching [the italics are ours], if the reunion of Christendom is to be achieved' (p. 24). 'The reunion of Christendom will not be on the basis of uniformity. It will be union in variety, in much difference of practice, ritual, and teaching' (p. 11). 'It is not reasonable to expect identity of custom or identity of teaching in all churches' (p. 26). The Bishop remarks most justly that 'the worst confusion of controversy arises from ambiguity. It is vain to discuss when we have not defined' (p. 37). But

'Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?'

This is exactly what we complain of in the Bishop himself. He discusses what he has not defined; he leaves us in that ambiguity from which arises the worst confusion of controversy. What is this 'teaching' in which there need not be 'identity' everywhere? Surely not the creeds of the Church? And yet—and yet—it really looks very like it from such passages as the following: 'Have you ever tried to estimate the number of separate theological propositions and statements which are to be found in the confessions of Christendom?' (p. 27). 'Would it be too much to say that the churches are waterlogged with dogma?' (p. 28). Now it would have been better if, instead of asking such questions, the Bishop had said straight out whether he did or whether he did not mean the creeds of the Catholic Church. He does not use the word 'creeds,' but he frequently uses the word 'creednda,' and 'creeds' and 'credenda' have a suspicious resemblance of meaning. If he had told us without any ambiguity that he

Jan.

n with

arith-

roporrity of

a with

with

ves no

ll, and

driven

order

tum in

vho, in

to be

a prein our e is no

would

y what several

Bishop

ing on

eration eaching

to be

on the

ference

able to

rches' nfusion

hen we

Ie dis-

ty from teach-

ely not

ery like

to esti-

ements p. 27). ed with

tead of

her he

Church.

e word

resemthat he

. He

meant the creeds, we should have known how to answer him; or, rather, we should have been quite content to refer him to a certain Dr. Waterland, who settled this matter effectually for Churchmen more than one hundred and fifty years ago. But instead of this he gives us beautiful but vague declamations about the blessings of unity and the evils of division. For instance, after the first of his recommendations of 'unity without uniformity,' and his insistence upon the recognition of differences of teaching as well as of ritual and ceremony, we have the following passage:

'Churches in which the pillars, though alike in height and strength, carry capitals carved with diverse leafage and flowers, give us a higher feeling of harmony than those in which every column is the dull, mechanical repetition of another. And so it was with those individuals and peoples who were chosen to be pillars in God's temples. All were alike in this, that they bore up the roof over the crowded heads of the worshippers; all stood firmly planted on earth and lifted their crests towards heaven, but they bore those varied crests as proudly and as naturally as they discharged their common duty. The oneness of the great purpose in which they were engaged received emphasis from the minor divergences by which they were distinguished' (p. 13).

Now what is the meaning of all this? Is it merely the episcopal way of expressing the sentiment, so familiar alas! to numberless clergy, which the simple Methodist utters when he says, 'We are all making for the same place'? Probably not; but if not, what is it? If one might say so without irreverence, it a little reminds us of a passage in the delightful Bab Ballads:

'His gentle spirit rolls
In the melody of souls—
Which is pretty, but I don't know what it means.'

The Bishop's thought and language are both very pretty, but what on earth do they mean?

There are other passages in which we can understand what the Bishop means well enough, but cannot quite agree with him. For instance, in the face of such utterances as those of Dr. Rigg on 'Oxford High Anglicanism,' or of Mr. Price Hughes on almost every subject connected with the Church, or of many others whom we need not specify, can we without many qualifications admit 'the growth of a kindlier and more fraternal spirit among Christian communions'? And, more especially, can we hope that on the part of Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians this spirit is growing; and men are wishful to think the best, not the worst, of one another'? (p. 217).

to think the best, not the worst, of one another'? (p. 217).

Again, we can understand, but we really cannot accept, the Bishop's theory that the reason why the English Church has steered clear of the Scylla of Ultramontanism on the one hand and the Charybdis of Polychurchism on the other is that the Anglo-Saxon race is neither 'long-headed' (dolicho-cephalic) nor 'short-headed' (brachy-cephalic), but has a head of a medium size (ortho-cephalic). (See pp. 113, 115, &c.) So far as we can read history, it appears to us that the undivided Church of the purest ages—say of the first five

of i

wa

lar

ch

pic

Th

lay

ene

to

the

Ca

wh

Th

in

del

app

me

Ca

Ch

ser

po

eit

the

Ste

up

WO

me

ver

wh

Ch

par

a v

Co

int

of

sor

led

tou

bu

Str

in

at

182

his

centuries—took precisely the same line, and there were surely longheaded men and short-headed men in it, as well as men with heads of a medium size.

Finally, though it is a matter of no real importance, an English bishop really should not reproduce a venerable quotation from Virgil in this unscholarly form:

'Non omnes omnia terræ ferre possunt.'

May we suggest that this is not a complete hexameter line, and that, in the order in which they are placed, the words do not make parts of two hexameter lines, as they do in Virgil?

Recollections of Persons and Events. By A. R. Pennington. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co., 1895.)

EVERY real student of history knows how invaluable are the 'Recol lections,' 'Reminiscences,' 'Remains,' 'Diaries,' 'Journals,' 'Collectections'—they go by various names—of contemporaries who have been brought into contact with the celebrated persons or events of their day. They are misleading if taken as authoritative history; the persons stood too near the persons or events they delineate to draw the picture in proper perspective; but, taken as illustrations of men and manners as they appeared at the time, they are quite indispens-No sensible person, for instance, would dream of accepting a fact solely on the authority of Pepys or Hearne. But, on the other hand, he would never dream of writing about the times of Charles II. without consulting his Pepys, or of the period between 1705 and 1735 without consulting his Hearne. From this point of view Canon Pennington may be regarded as having rendered valuable service to the future historian, and especially the Church historian, of England; for, as will appear presently, he has been brought into contact with a great number of interesting and distinguished persons who flourished in the second quarter of the present century; and, unlike such writers as Pepys and Hearne, he never allows a single word of malice or illnature to disfigure his pages. He writes, from beginning to end, as a Christian and a gentleman should write, without passion and without prejudice. The only person of whom he has even a hard word to say is poor 'Satan Montgomery;' and Robert Montgomery has been so hopelessly torn to pieces by Lord Macaulay that he cannot be rehabilitated, and no further dispraise can possibly affect him. But the volume before us is full of interest and value for the general reader as well as for the specialist and the future historian; for it treats of just those 'persons and events' that are apt to fall, as it were, between two stools; being too far back to come within the personal recollection of the majority, and not far enough back to be matters of history. Canon Pennington was brought up from his infancy in an atmosphere of interesting people. He was born at Clapham, in a house still standing and close to that in which Lord Macaulay was brought up, in what he rightly calls 'the golden age of Clapham Common.' family had lived in the same parish since the middle of the eighteenth century; so his own personal reminiscences are supplemented by those nglish Virgil hat, in arts of

long-

heads

Recol collechave nts of ; the f men spensting a other les II. 11735 Canon rice to gland ; with a rished vriters or illnd, as ithout to say een so rehaut the der as of just tween

collec-

istory.

sphere

se still

ht up,

teenth those

His

of his parents, who were both evidently very intelligent, while his father was a really distinguished man in his own particular line. He regularly worshipped during his childhood and youth in that old parish church in the middle of the Common of which we have so vivid a picture in the pages of Mr. J. C. Colquhoun: 'On the Sunday the Thorntons sat in the old church with the Wilberforces' and Macaulays' and Stephens' pews close to their own, and in the front gallery the Teignmouths, and listened to the wise discourses of Venn, or sat enchanted under the preaching of Gisborne.' I John Venn had gone to his rest before Canon Pennington's time, but his mother told him much about that eminently wise and good man, which fully bears out the impression we had formed of him. The rector of Clapham in Canon Pennington's day was Dr., afterwards Archdeacon, Dealtry, whom he evidently regarded with the utmost reverence and affection. These old evangelical clergy certainly had a way of winning the confidence and the hearts of their people, which is too often wanting in their successors. Clapham must have been a parish that required delicate management; but both Mr. John Venn and Dr. Dealtry appear to have managed it admirably. Dr. Dealtry was also the means of introducing into Clapham, and therefore into the notice of Canon Pennington, other clergymen distinguished in their day, notably Charles Bradley, father of the present Dean of Westminster, whose sermons, most deservedly as we can testify, were extraordinarily popular, and had a large sale when printed. Canon Pennington either knew personally or had heard directly from his mother of all the members of the 'Clapham sect' immortalized by Sir James Stephen; and there is a real pathos as well as truth in the summing up of his account of them: 'I have thus brought forward all these works of those distinguished men which had their origin or development on Clapham Common. Only those who lived at that time, very few of whom now remain, can understand the veneration with which I and others were taught to regard the holy and devoted Christians who have come before us. We were proud of our native parish, because those men had lived in it' (p. 19). And then he pays a well-deserved tribute to their real piety and earnestness.

Perhaps this chapter, which he entitles 'Recollections of Clapham Common and of its Former Inhabitants,' is the most important and interesting part of Canon Pennington's work; but there is abundance of interest also in his other 'Recollections,' as a mere enumeration of some of the 'persons and events' described from personal knowledge will suffice to show. Among his 'Literary Recollections' he touches on Sir James Graham's speech, which he heard at the distribution of prizes in the newly founded London University in Gower Street, in 1830; the sermon which he heard Bishop Blomfield preach in 1831 at the opening of King's College, London; the lectures at the London University which he attended during the sessions of 1829-30 and 1830-1; the absurd affectation with which youths of his own standing used to imitate even the physical infirmities of Lord

<sup>1</sup> William Wilberforce, his Friends and his Times, p. 309.

18

hi

TI

co

we

are

tru

do

ar

D

th

Re

N

47

H

10

ne

igi

to

wa

ali

WC

ha

the

sc

kn

pu

pla

att

wi

ha

m

ha

ou

ing

be

In his 'Political Recollections' he gives an amusing illustration of the admiration in which the deportment of 'the first gentleman in Europe' was held. His mother had a ticket to be present at the trial of Lord Melville; and she and those who accompanied her said: 'We must make a point of being early, because we must see the bow of the Prince of Wales to the Woolsack.' As early as 1831 he used to visit the House of Commons, when Charles Manners Sutton, 'a man of a very dignified presence,' was Speaker. He heard the introduction of the Reform Bill in 1831, and Macaulay's wonderful speeches in support of the Bill, and also Lord Brougham's famous speech in the House of Lords on the same subject. He also saw 'the noble figure of Earl Grey,' and heard him rebuke Bishop Phillpotts, who spoke against the Bill. He regarded it as 'one of his greatest treats to go to the House of Commons to hear the masterly speeches' of Sir Robert Peel. He 'once saw in the House the herculean frame, and heard the wonderful voice, unsurpassed for strength and sweetness, of Daniel O'Connell,' and the once famous but now forgotten orator, Sheil. He was sitting in the library of Lincoln's Inn on June 18, 1832, when the Duke of Wellington was obliged to take refuge in the Inn from the mob, who were infuriated against him for his action in regard to the Reform Bill. In his 'Recollections of Bishops' he gives us most interesting accounts from personal knowledge of Archbishops Manners Sutton, Howley, and J. B. Sumner; of Bishop Sumner of Winchester, Bishops D. Wilson, Heber, and Cotton, all of Calcutta, of the last-named of whom he was the intimate college friend. As an instance of his desire to be fair all round, it may be noted that, though he evidently has the greatest regard for Bishop Sumner of Winchester, in whose diocese he worked for five years, he records, with an implied though not expressed disapproval, the Bishop's partiality in limiting his patronage to the Evangelical party. 'He showed his predilection for it by filling the close with leading members of that party'-one of whom was Canon Pennington's own 'beloved rector,' Archdeacon Dealtryand 'he never appointed John Keble, the most distinguished man in his diocese, to a stall in the Cathedral, because he was one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement' (p. 163). In his last chapter he tells us how he attended every Sunday the ministry of Charles Simeon at Trinity Church, Cambridge, having often heard him preach before at Clapham Church. He used to meet him 'at private parties during the two years he passed at Cambridge before his death,' and he was one of those many members of the University who 'walked four abreast' at the unprecedented demonstration made at Cambridge on the occasion of Simeon's funeral. In his concluding pages he gives us most interesting sketches, from personal knowledge, of some preachers who in their day were 'famous men, men of renown,' but whose names are perhaps scarcely known to the rising generation; of Henry Melvill, who, he says, 'united, in a manner which I never saw equalled, a vivid imagination with great powers of reasoning;' Thomas Dale, 'a rival of Canon Melvill as a preacher in London;' Hugh Stowell, Hugh McNeile, and others. But we must not follow

XUM

illus-

entle-

resent

anied

must

rly as

nners

onder-

amous

so saw

Phill-

of his

asterly

se the

ed for

amous ary of on was

riated s 'Refrom

y, and

Vilson,

om he

to be

as the

iocese

ot ex-

onage

it by

whom

ter he

imeon before

during

ne was

d four

e gives some

n, but

ation;

never

don:

follow

nltry nan in of the him further. Enough has been said, we trust, to fire our readers with a determination to read his book for themselves; and we are quite sure they will never regret it, if they carry their determination into effect.

The Creed of the Christian. By Charles Gore, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection, Canon of Westminster, lately Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. (London: Thomas Hibberd, 1895.)

This is the first of a proposed 'series of little books,' which is to consist of 'articles already published in the magazine *Goodwill*.' It is composed of the papers which, on their appearance in the magazine, were entitled *Fundamentals*. They are seventeen in number, and are intended to remove prejudice against the dogmatic expression of artuth and to explain in simple language and methods the chief doctrines of the Christian Faith. The subjects of them are 'What are Dogmas?' 'The Fatherhood of God,' 'What are Christian Dogmas?' 'A Dialogue on the Holy Trinity,' 'Revelation, or the Word of God,' 'The Incarnation of the Son of God,' 'Sin and Redemption,' 'The Atonement,' 'The Holy Spirit—the Giver of New Life,' 'The Bible in the Church,' 'The Inspiration of Scripture,' 'The Church the Household of Grace,' 'Faith and Grace,' 'The Holy Eucharist, or Holy Communion,' 'The Apostolic Succession,' 'Our Unseen Enemies and Friends,' 'The Other Side of Death.'

The most striking feature of the articles is their simplicity and clearness. It is not always the case that a writer of Canon Gore's eminence is willing to spend time in the service of the poorer and more ignorant classes; and sometimes, when a man of learning attempts to teach them, he fails through being unable to write or to speak in ways which they can understand. Canon Gore is to be congratulated alike on the moral earnestness which has led him to undertake this work and on the powers of clear thought and simple expression which

have enabled him to do it well.

One of the great needs of our time in the Church of England is the steady and persistent teaching of Christian dogma. Church schools will fail to accomplish their proper end unless accurate knowledge of the elements of the Faith is imparted in them. The pulpit misses a large part of the usefulness it ought to have when the place of instruction in preaching is made little of. Similarly, any attempt to increase practical religion must include the clear teaching

of revealed truth.

We appreciate so highly the spirit and the execution of this book that we prefer to say little in the way of criticism. But we could wish that in a very few passages (pp. 28, 36, 44, 69, 71-2) Canon Gore had seen his way to a choice of phraseology or a limitation of statement that, without surrendering anything he himself accepts, would have rendered these passages less uncongenial to those who, like ourselves, cannot agree with him on all points; that there was teaching on the continuous Divine guidance of the Church as well as on its character as a witness by means of tradition; and that more care had been taken to prevent the last article from seeming to lend support to the idea of a new probation after death.

We may quote the following passage as an instance of the style of the little volume:—

'I can explain briefly, and once for all, what is the ground of all Christian dogmas. They are simply those truths which a man must hold if he is to share the life which Christ brought into the world: and if he is to have fellowship in the faith, the hope, the love which He made possible. This faith, hope, and love, this Christian life, is based on truths which were imparted to men, or confirmed to them, by Jesus Christ in His example and in His teaching. This life, with the truths on which it rests, was committed by Christ to His Apostles, and through them to the visible society or Church which is to represent Him in the world until the end. Christian dogmas, then, are simply statements of those truths which are the necessary background or basis of the Christian life.

'For their justification we make appeal in part to experience, past and present—to the life which, in fact, has been lived ever since the beginning of Christianity by those who have really believed these truths. We ask men to pay attention and see what peace, what strength, what hope, what love has come of believing. Can such a beautiful and constant result be due to anything else than that these truly Christian men and women have got at the secret of human life, and have power to live noble lives because they have a hold on eternal truth? But we appeal also to history—to the Gospels which tell us of what Christ was, what He claimed to be; how He lived and suffered and taught and died and rose again, and reigns for ever; and to Apostolic Epistles and Acts, which tell us how His first disciples thought of Him. That we have very good reason for believing that these documents are genuine and contain authentic history, I am sure. I am sure also that any one who studies them as impartially as he would study ordinary history, will come to this conclusion also' (pp. 16–7).

Historical Essays. By the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Published by the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

The trustees of the Lightfoot Fund are to be congratulated on the publication of this delightful book. The Bishop of Durham, in his Prefatory Note, says that the lectures which it contains 'present' Bishop Lightfoot's 'character and reading under a somewhat different aspect from that which is shown in his writings that have been already published' (p. v); and this 'aspect' is certainly one which it is a pleasure to contemplate.

The volume contains three lectures on 'Christian Life in the Second and Third Centuries,' an essay on the 'Comparative Progress of Ancient and Modern Missions,' two lectures on 'England during the Latter Half of the Thirteenth Century,' an unfinished paper on 'The Chapel of St. Peter and the Manor House of Auckland, an attempt to elucidate some points in their past history,' and a lecture on 'Donne, the Poet-preacher.'

The paper on 'The Chapel of St. Peter and the Manor House of Auckland' will be useful chiefly to those who have already studied the questions with which it is concerned, and its details can hardly be regarded as being of very great interest to the ordinary reader;

beyorig com whice exar quir by t that

189

but

bec

pers that more in B

prop

Don

sequ the p

to le

was

inclination inclin

show failur will centu

Donn poem VO Jan.

style

of all

hold

he is

sible.

vhich

His ch it m to

world

those

istian

past

uths.

what

men

live

ppeal

what l and

Acts.

e very ontain

them

con-

C.L.,

ees of

n the

in his

esent'

ferent

been

which

n the

ogress

luring

'The

tempt

re on

use of

udied

hardly

ader;

;.)

but all readers of intelligence will welcome the fact of its publication because of the illustration which it affords of a feature of Bishop Lightfoot's character, and will appreciate the remarks which Bishop Westcott makes in connexion with it:

'The unfinished essay on "Auckland Castle," while it establishes beyond doubt the nature and extent of Bishop Cosin's work and the original use of the present chapel, does not touch on the difficult and complicated problem of the date of the arcade and other early fragments which it includes. But though incomplete, the essay is a remarkable example of the enthusiasm with which the Bishop threw himself into inquiries, foreign to the general line of his studies, which were suggested by the circumstances of his life. He gave himself without reserve to all that fell within the range of his immediate duties. In this lay the secret of his strength and of his happiness. It was a kind of martyrdom to him to leave Cambridge; but, when the change was once made, Cambridge was forgotten in the wider activities of Durham.' 1

The lecture on Donne gives, in a short space, a clear idea of the personality and sermons of the 'poet-preacher,' and contains much that is suggestive of useful thought. It is not without a flash of the moral indignation which, controlled as it was, is now and then shown in Bishop Lightfoot's writings:

'I know of no crime more unpardonable in itself, or more fatal in its consequences, than this of prostituting the highest gifts of genius to a propaganda of vice and shame, this of poisoning the wells of a nation's literature and spreading moral death through generations yet unborn.<sup>2</sup> Donne's penitence was intense; he did all he could to retrieve the consequences of his sin. But he could not undo his work, could not blot out the printed page' (pp. 227-8).

The essay on Missions may be reassuring to some who are inclined to despond about the future of missionary work. A 'comparison' 'of the proportion of the Christian population to the whole human race' in 'the middle of the third century, when the Gospel had been preached for nearly two centuries and a quarter, amid all the discouragements of a worldly opposition, but with all the zeal of a new-born enthusiasm,' and at the present time, 'when it has passed through a chequered career of almost eighteen centuries and a half' (pp. 73-4), and the consideration of 'some analogies between ancient and modern Missions' (p. 82), lead the Bishop to a distinctly hopeful view. His extraordinary knowledge and calm and equitable judgment give special interest and importance to his opinion on this point, and it may be well that we should quote his concluding words:

'In this comparison of the present with the past, I have attempted to show that the Missions of the nineteenth century are in no sense a failure. But I seem to see the advent of a more glorious future, if we will only nerve ourselves to renewed efforts. During the past half-century we have only been learning our work as a Missionary Church.

<sup>1</sup> Prefatory Note, pp. vi-vii.

<sup>2</sup> A note is here added: 'It must be remembered, however, that Donne was not in many cases responsible for the *publication* of his poems. They were published for the most part after his death.'

VOL. XLI.-NO. LXXXII.

NN

n

b

0

to

o

of

C

fo

fo

of

B

B

ĥe

op

lea

qu

lit

un

tis

un

Ar

At length experience is beginning to tell. India is our special charge, as a Christian nation; India is our hardest problem, as a Missionary Church. Hitherto we have kept too exclusively to beaten paths. Our mode of dealing with the Indian has been too conventional, too English. Indian Christianity can never be cast in the same mould as English Christianity. We must make up our minds to this. The stamp of teaching, the mode of life, which experience has justified as the best possible for an English parish, may be very unfit when transplanted into an Indian soil. We must become as Indians to the Indian if we would win India to Christ. This lesson of the past I find frankly recognized and courageously avowed from at least two distinct quarters of the Indian Mission-field quite recently—in the stirring appeal which the Bishop of Bombay 1 has addressed to the English Church through our Archbishop, and in those noble letters from Lahore, so zealous, so thoughtful, and so bold, which Mr. French has written to the Church Missionary Society. This coincidence, representing, as I doubt not, a much wider feeling, is surely full of hope for the future 1 (pp. 91-2).

The lectures on 'Christian Life in the Second and Third Centuries' are well calculated to give clear and accurate ideas on the three subjects of which they treat, 'the relations of the Christian to society,' 'the relations of Church and State,' and 'Christian worship' (p. 9). They must have been fascinating when they were delivered, and it would be hard for a reader to lay down the book in the course of them. They afford an excellent instance of a learned and accomplished historian utilizing his knowledge for popular instruction with rare skill. From many passages we should like to quote one on the simplicity of the worship of the early Church:

'We cannot fail to be struck with the contrast between the present and the past. Can it be, we are led to ask, that these later forms of worship are a perversion of the simplicity of the Gospel? that we have entirely departed from the principles of primitive Christianity in the elaborate developments of our architecture, our music, our ritual? moment's reflection will check this hasty inference which we might be tempted to draw from the contrast. I have already said that this feature in early Christianity was not a deliberate choice, but an enforced abstention. I would now urge (for this consideration is still more important) that it was also a necessary discipline, a providential design, in the early education of the Church. . . . I pointed out in an earlier lecture how polytheism insinuated itself into every department of public duty and every corner of domestic life. But while thus ubiquitous and intrusive, it was essentially external. It made large demands on its worshippers; but these demands were confined to conformity in outward rites. It did not appeal to the heart, and it did not reform the life. The heathen did not understand religion as a moral and spiritual influence. His only conception of it was as an elaborate system of sacrifices, lustrations, auspices; a multiplication of shrines and a multiplication of deities. It was necessary, for the future of the Church, that the Christian should break once for all with the spirit of Paganism. By the stern teaching of in imperious necessity, he was weaned from this false and low conception of religion. The external symbols and appliances-the buildings, the

We are not told the date of this essay, and there is no note on this place. We assume that the reference is to the famous letter of Bishop Douglas.

ge, as

hurch.

ode of

ndian

mode

nglish . We

Christ.

n-field

y 1 has

those

coin-

ely full

turies'

three

ociety,'

(p. 9). and it of the ed and

astruc-

quote

present orms of

e have in the

ight be

at this

ore im-

earlier

f public

ous and

on its

fluence.

, lustra-

deities.

ching of

nception ngs, the

on this Bishop

e. The

al?

music, the paintings, and the sculptures—which may be innocent and useful to us, were denied, or almost denied, to him, that, thus thrown back upon his own spiritual resources, he might lay the foundations of a spiritual fabric. This training was to the infancy of the Church what the careful seclusion and the enforced simplicity of life is to the infancy of the individual—the necessary discipline of the child for the freedom and the development of manhood. Much that would have been injurious then is useful—we might almost say is indispensable—now? (pp. 55-6).

The lectures on 'England during the Latter Half of the Thirteenth Century,' delivered before the Philosophical Institution in Edinburgh in 1814, are the gem of the volume. It is unnecessary that we should attempt to show that Bishop Lightfoot had the most complete and intimate knowledge of any subject which he undertook to handle, and no statements in a review could give an adequate idea of the skill and grace which mark the composition of these lectures. We have no room to quote the brilliant summary of the great men of the period referred to (pp. 94-6), or the just estimate of the Crusades (p. 104), or the admirable description of Simon de Montfort (pp. 112-3), or the comments on the statue of Richard I. and the tomb of Edward I. at Westminster (pp. 137-9), or any part of the account of thirteenth-century University life (pp. 156-66), or the testimony to the wisdom of Walter de Merton, 'the enlightened founder of Merton College' (p. 166), or even to mention numbers of subjects of the greatest interest treated in the most charming way. But we must find space for one illustration of the humour which Bishop Lightfoot generally restrained, of which there are many instances in these lectures:

'It is related of a wit of our day that he overheard a lady, as she passed by, calling his favourite dog an ugly little brute. "Oh, madam," he said, "I should like to know what he thinks of us at this moment!" Yes, I should like to know what these old schoolmen think of us at this moment. I wish I could raise the ghost of Duns Scotus and ask his opinion about the studies of the nineteenth century. I have an uncomfortable misgiving that he might not think quite as highly as we do of our learned discussions on antispasts and ischiorrhogics and epitrites. I question whether he would be altogether lost in admiration at the fertility and subtlety which produces volume after volume of absolutely uncertain emendations on absolutely corrupt passages of Greek dramatists' (pp. 173-4).

It remains to say that the work was partly prepared for the press by the Bishop of Adelaide, and that the Master of University College, Durham, completed what Bishop Harmer 'was obliged to leave unfinished' ('Prefatory Note,' p. vii).

Pascal and other Sermons. By the late R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L., Dean of St. Paul's and Honorary Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

This volume contains a lecture on Bishop Butler, delivered in Salisbury Cathedral during Advent 1880, a lecture on Bishop Andrewes delivered at King's College in 1877, and nineteen sermons.

NN2

Three of the sermons have appeared before in Companions for the Devout Life, The Use and Abuse of the World, and a collection of Lent Sermons published by Messrs. Parker; and the lecture on Bishop Andrewes formed part of the volume entitled Masters in English Theology.

The contents of the book are throughout marked by the well-known characteristics of Dean Church's writings. The careful use of language to express his exact meaning, the deep sense of the claims of God and of truth, the thoughts of the value and solemnity of human life and of the responsibility of man, the recognition of facts and problems that are not easy to fit into clear theories, the insistence on the services rendered by Christianity to much in the present, as on its work in relation to the eternal future, are all to be found here. It follows that the volume is calculated to stimulate thought and educate the mind and deepen character; while it is no reflexion upon the worth of the sermons to say that we do not think them equal to the various admirable series published in the Dean's lifetime, or to several which are contained in the Cathedral and University Sermons published since his death.

The sermons, then, are all worthy of careful study, and the subjects of some of them, as 'Education,' and 'Pain and Remedy,' and The Life of Intellectual Self-sufficiency,' and 'Foreign Travel,' and 'The Times and Seasons of God's Working,' are of such a kind as to make Dean Church's treatment of them of special interest. But the most valuable part of the book—more valuable, in our judgment, than even the sermon on 'The Pensées of Blaise Pascal,' or the lecture on Bishop Butler—is the lecture on Bishop Andrewes. We have long been acquainted with it and recognized its value through its former publication in Masters in English Theology, and it is a special satisfaction to us to know of the probability that it will now be brought to the notice of a wider circle of readers than has hitherto been The lecture treats of the life and character of Bishop Andrewes, but its real subject is the historical position and true standpoint of the Church of England. We hope that any of our readers who do not already know it will study it for themselves; but we cannot refrain from quoting two passages, which indicate its general point of view.

'The English Church, at its Reformation, had taken up its ground on the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. It had avowed its object to be a return, as far as was possible, to what the teaching of the Apostles and their disciples had made the Primitive Church to be. At the outset, all that was much insisted upon was that the Primitive Church was certainly not like the modern unreformed Latin Church. By the end of Elizabeth's reign, men had found leisure to inquire carefully and honestly, with less prejudice and heat, what that model was like, which the English Church had declared its wish to copy in all things essential. Arms were still needed, as much as ever, against the never-ceasing hostility of Rome; but something more was clearly necessary than the mere negations of earlier controversy and invectives against Roman corruption and pretensions; some more positive ground on which to rest the claim that England was better and more primitive than Rome. Such a

b

n of e on rs in welluse nnity on of

Jan

r the

1 the to be ulate is no think ean's l and

, the

e sub-'and , and , and as to ut the , than ire on e long ormer satisought been Bishop standeaders out we eneral

ground object postles outset, ch was end of nestly, e Eng-Arms ostility e mere corrupest the

Such a

ground it was not easy to find in that narrow Calvinism which the Puritans were trying to force on the Government, and to make the popular religion of the country. Something was wanted broader, more intelligible, and more refined than their mode of presenting the ideas of justification and God's predestinating and electing grace, and their fashion of summing up loyalty to Christ and truth in petty scruples about innocent and natural usages and ceremonies. Something was wanted as fervent, but more true, more noble, more Catholic, than their devotion and self-discipline. The higher spirits of the time wanted to breathe more freely, and in a purer air. They found what they wanted in the language, the ideas, the tone and temper of the best early Christian literature. That turned their thoughts from words to a Person. It raised them from the disputes of local cliques to the ideas which have made the Universal Church. It recalled them from arguments that revolved round a certain number of traditional formulæ about justification, free-will, and faith, to a truer and worthier idea both of man and God, to the overwhelming revelation of the Word Incarnate, and the result of it on the moral standard and behaviour of real and living men. It led them from a theology which ended in cross-grained and perverse conscientiousness to a theology which ended in adoration, self-surrender, and blessing, and in the awe and joy of welcoming the Presence of the Eternal Beauty, the Eternal Sanctity, and the Eternal Love, the Sacrifice

and Reconciliation of the world ' (pp. 76-7).

'Andrewes marks a period and a step in the unfolding of the theology of the Reformed Church of England and in the practical course of the Reformation. Hooker had vindicated on its behalf the rights of Christian and religious reason, that reason which is a reflection of the mind of God. Andrewes vindicated on its behalf the rights of Christian history. Hooker had maintained the claims of reason against a slavish bondage to narrow and arbitrary interpretations of the letter of Scripture. Andrewes claimed for the English Church its full interest and membership in the Church Universal, from which Puritan and Romanist alike would cut off the island Church by a gulf as deep as The spirit of historical investigation had awoke in England, as in the rest of Europe, against the passion for abstract and metaphysical argument which had marked and governed the earlier stages of the Reformation. It had converted Casaubon from Calvinism, and at the same time made him the most formidable critic of the magnificent but unhistorical picture presented in the annals of Baronius. Widened knowledge had done as much for Andrewes and the men of his school-Field and Donne and Overall—may I not add, in this matter, Andrewes's close friend, Lord Bacon? History had enlarged their ideas of the Church Universal. Its facts and concrete lessons and actual words had overborne the traditions and general assumptions in which the necessities of an age of religious war had educated them. They opened their eyes and saw that the prerogatives which the Puritans confined to an invisible Church, and which Rome confined to the obedience of the Pope, belonged to the universal historical Church, lasting on with varied fortunes through all the centuries from the day of Pentecost; on earth "the habitation of God through the Spirit." Maintaining jealously and stoutly the inherent and indefeasible rights of the national Church of England, and resisting with uncompromising determination the tyranny which absorbed in a single hand the powers of the Catholic Church, they refused to forget, even in England, what God's Spirit had done in other portions of Christendom, perhaps far removed, perhaps for the time bitterly hostile. They learned to pray, as Andrewes did, "for the

t

b

W

tl

a

0

sl

T

th

C

th

n

ta

CI fo

ar

ar

re

fo

· I

th

18

Catholic Church, its establishment and increase; for the Eastern, its deliverance and union; for the Western, its adjustment and peace; for the British, the supply of what is wanting in it, the strengthening of that which remains in it." They recognized the authority of its great and unquestionable decisions. They were willing to appeal to its authority, if it could be expressed legitimately. They introduced even into controversy, at least to some extent, the habits of discrimination and respect. Their teaching shows how, after the first fever of excitement of the revolt against Roman usurpation had passed, the leaders of the English Church felt that much natural misstatement and exaggeration had to be qualified and corrected; it shows how anxious they were, in accordance with the declared policy of the Reformation, to keep hold on the undivided and less corrupted Church of the early centuries as their standard and guide; it shows how much they found, in their increased acquaintance with it, to enrich, to enlarge, to invigorate, to give beauty, proportion, and force to their theology' (pp. 90-2).

1. The Unity of Christendom. A Sermon by the Archbishop of York (William Dalrymple Maclagan, D.D.), preached in the Cathedral, Norwich, at the opening of the Church Congress, on Tuesday morning, October 8, 1895. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1895.)

2. Visitation Charge. Delivered by His Grace the LORD ARCH-BISHOP OF YORK in the Cathedral Church of York, on Wednesday, October 23, 1895. (York: John Sampson, 1895.)

THE Archbishop of York is entitled to the gratitude of English Churchmen. At the present time, as he expresses it, 'Reunion is in the air;' and a letter 'in many ways remarkable and in some senses unique' has been addressed to the people of England by

the presiding bishop of one of the most ancient, and certainly the most widely extended, branches of the Catholic Church; a Church which has reared a multitude of saints, and sent forth a noble army of martyrs; a Church which has furnished us with a vast treasury of theological literature; a Church to which in long past centuries, in the time of our weakness and adversity, we were indebted for valuable and loving help.'

At such a time it is easy to make mistakes of an opposite character. The sympathetic force of the Pope's letter is likely to lead some to forget the greatness of the obstacles which bar the way to reunion, and, by assuming that there are no differences of moment between England and Rome, really to introduce a new hindrance to any kind of reunion which would be healthy and permanent. In an opposite direction a want of courage and insight to understand the needs of the present and the history of the past may lead others to a non possumus attitude which, by practically ascribing to certain actions of the English Church, at particular periods, an infallible character, makes the mistake of Rome without having Rome's excuse.

The Archbishop of York has been careful to avoid both mistakes. He does not make light of 'the barrier to reunion' which 'lies in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Sermon, pp. 6-7.

1896

ern, its ce; for ning of s great s authoen into on and itement of the geration were, in hold on as their

shop of ched in h Conl under ciety for

ARCH-

creased

beauty,

n Wed-5.) English mion is n some by

the most hich has rtyrs; a al literaur weaklp.' 1

opposite likely to the way moment rance to ent. In derstand d others o certain infallible Rome's

nistakes. 'lies in the Papal claim,' 1 while he emphatically declares that 'it is not enough to sit still with folded hands, even if they are folded in prayer,' 2 that 'no thoughtful man can honestly believe that the present state of Christendom is according to the will of Christ,' 3 and that 'the Reformation' 'was initiated and carried on by fallible men.' 4

For the Charge, as for the Sermon, we tender to the Archbishop our respectful thanks. It breathes the spirit of a true pastor no less than the Sermon speaks the mind of a statesman.<sup>5</sup>

Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts; being a History of the Text and its Translations. By Frederic G. Kenyon, M.A., D. Litt., Hon. Ph.D. of Halle University; late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

This is an excellent book. Mr. Kenyon is well known to scholars by the work that he has done in reading and publishing Greek papyri, and his position in the British Museum enables him to speak with authority on a large portion of the ground covered. For the rest he has invariably gone to the very best authorities; he puts forward their views clearly and correctly, and on debated questions gives very ably the opinions of both sides. He does not shrink from giving his own opinion when the evidence seems to warrant it, and he does not shrink from stating that in some cases the question is not yet settled. The book is intended for unlearned, but cultivated and intelligent, readers. There are no unnecessary technicalities, and it is written in an easy and pleasant style.

Mr. Kenyon begins by two general chapters on the variations in the Bible text, and the classes of authorities for studying them. Then comes an account of the original manuscripts of the Bible, describing the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, the Egyptian papyrus books, and the earliest writing on skins and vellum. Here Mr. Kenyon's judiciousness is very apparent. He points out just what the Tel-el-Amarna tablets prove:

'Even if we accept the very latest date which the most advanced criticism has assigned to the composition of the Pentateuch in its present form, the compilers of it must have used records of a far earlier date, and among them, as we now see, may have been clay tablets, contemporaneous with the events narrated in the history' (p. 19).

Chapters iv. and v. are devoted to the Hebrew text and the ancient versions of the Old Testament. On the questions of the relation of the LXX to the Massoretic text Mr. Kenyon sums up as follows:

'It is probable that a much fuller use will be made of the Septuagint than has hitherto been the case, and those have done good work who

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Sermon, pp. 13-4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 17. <sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> It is not without interest to observe that the Sermon has attracted the attention of the Abbé Portal; see *Revue Anglo-Romaine* of December 7, 1895, p. 5.

tl

tl

C

to

h

B

te

th

an

ac

or

w

have called attention, even in exaggerated tones, to the claims of the ancient Greek Version; but no general substitution of the Greek for the Hebrew as the prime authority for the text of the Old Testament will be possible unless the universal assent of students be won to the change. . . It is very doubtful whether such a conviction will ever be reached? (p. 91).

There is a very lucid chapter on the text of the New Testament, although we are not quite certain that the best place for it would not have been after Chap. viii. It is one of the few places we know of in which a clear and popular account of the theory of Westcott and Hort and the scientific character of their method is given. Mr. Kenyon sums up in favour of Westcott and Hort. But why does he persist in giving all credit for the new theory to Dr. Hort? He suggests, however, a modification: that the formal revision in or about Antioch may be a myth. 'It seems possible,' he writes, 'that the Syrian text is the result rather of a process continued over a considerable period of time than of a set revision by constituted authorities' (p. 114). He then goes on to describe the character of the revision as he thinks that it took place, in language with which we imagine Dr. Westcott would largely concur. It has always seemed to us that the very formal character ascribed to this revision was very largely due to its opponents. The word 'revision' suggested to them the Revised Version, and they seem to have imagined that a synod of Bishops appointed a committee, and they wonder that no record of such an event exists. We imagine that Dr. Hort pictured the process much more as Mr. Kenyon does than as Dean Burgon One statement we must demur to. We hardly see how Eusebius could be responsible for the spread of the Antiochian text. His writings do not show that he used it, and all the evidence we have connects the library of Pamphilus with a very different type of manuscript.

We may add that the directions in which Dr. Hort's theory may be possibly modified will in no case mean the restoration of the Textus Receptus. It is possible, however, that the Neutral group may be dethroned from its dominant position. Western readings will not be accepted, but in some cases Western authorities may preserve a better text; for it must be remembered that they represent a primitive

tradition, independently preserved.

In the chapter on the Versions we must demur to the treatment of the new Sinaitic MS. Mr. Kenyon states that, in the now wellknown passage, it emphatically denies the Miraculous Conception. and then he goes on to say that it gives 'an inconsistent story of what purports to be a natural event' (p. 156). We think his statement of the whole question is unfortunate, and we much prefer the view expressed by Mr. Allen in a letter to the Academy, and by Mr. Burkitt in his paper at the Church Congress. Even if 'Joseph begat Jesus' be the original reading, it means no more than that Joseph was the legal father of Jesus. The phrase is used throughout this genealogy in a purely legal and technical sense. It is perfectly certain that Jechoniah did not beget Shealtiel, and that in other

of the or the will be ached?

ment. ld not v of in tt and Mr. oes he in or over a tituted cter of which

eemed as very ted to that a hat no ctured Burgon e how n text. nce we type of

ry may of the ip may will not serve a imitive

atment w welleption, story of s statefer the by Mr. h begat Joseph ut this erfectly other

instances in the genealogy the phrase is used in a purely technical sense. Why then should not the writer have used it in an equally technical sense in the last clause? The difficulty, if there is one, is quite independent of any question of reading; it lies in the fact that

it is through Joseph that the genealogy is traced.

After giving an account of the history of the text and the early versions, Mr. Kenyon continues the history of the Bible to our own times. First of all, following M. Berger, he gives the history of the Vulgate during the middle ages. Then he gives an account of the early manuscript translations in English, with a very careful account of the Wycliffe versions. Father Gasquet's theory he treats with great courtesy and fairness, but makes it very clear that it is only a brilliant paradox. Protestant historians have exaggerated the evils of the mediæval papacy, but the facts of the Reformation cannot be got over. If events had proceeded as the wiser Romanists wished, a quiet reformation might have taken place all over the Continent, and the Bible have been translated by the Church; but as a matter of fact this was impossible.

The last chapter gives an account of the printed English Bible, concluding with a judicious defence of the Revised Version. Mr. Kenyon reminds us that it took quite sixty years for the Authorized Version to obtain undisputed supremacy, and points out that we cannot, until more than at least one generation has passed, say what will be the fate of the Revised Version. It should be left to work its way on its own merits. We are persuaded that any attempt to force it into general acceptance would be alike distasteful and disastrous.

We can well afford to wait.

We have stated very clearly our opinion of this work. It collects together a large amount of accurate knowledge, which is usually to be found only in a number of different volumes. It gives us the history of the Hebrew text, of the Greek text, of the Latin Bible, and the English Bible. It is throughout scholarly, and abreast of the newest information, and is written in an attractive and popular style.

The Bible and the Monuments. The Primitive Hebrew Records in the light of Modern Research. By W. St. Chad Boscawen, Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, Member of the Society of Bibli-(London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895.) cal Archæology.

THE recovery of the historical records of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon by the deciphering of ancient monuments forms an interesting and thrilling tale, even apart from its effects. But when these records are considered in relation to the Hebrew Scriptures, it is remarkable that they come to hand at a crucial moment, when learned sceptics have endeavoured to relegate the traditions of the Old Testament to the company of the myths and fables of Greece and Rome. Moreover, it is now possible to test the historical accuracy of the Bible in innumerable matters which are mentioned on the monuments, and also the faithfulness of the Bible traditions which are the bases of the doctrines of revelation. And in the case of the Babylonian legends especially, the test is not merely one of

18

fac

ace

wh

tin

for

fra

A

fift

wit

wh

tat

lay

of

sig

rec

wo

64,

of tha

the

rea

Th

stil

wa it i

ser

St.

ope

(p.

the

bo

of a

gar

bu

wh

is t

reli to

Th

mythological or poetic similarities, but, as Mr. Boscawen points out, it extends into the closest philological comparison (pp. 6, 7). Hitherto this comparative study has been possible only for specialists, but Mr. Boscawen's object, in the series of which this is the first volume, is to place the materials for the comparison before the general reader. He has done his work in a first-rate manner, and, if he has the knowledge of a specialist himself, he has avoided the dangerous limitation by which a specialist is often enslaved; and he is able to recognize the claims of other important districts of truth, outside the range of his special investigations. He provides the reader with a table of contents, a list of references to Scripture texts, and a rich supply of illustrations, which for the most part have been reproduced from photographs taken by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode from the originals.

It is upon the early traditions of the Hebrew people that the

materials in this volume chiefly bear, and more than one-third of the passages of Holy Scripture on which light is thrown occur in the Book of Genesis. We are prepared for the consideration of the full force of the comparison by what may be regarded as an introductory chapter on the Hebrew and Assyrian languages. Mr. Boscawen shows that, 'racially and linguistically, the Hebrews and the ancient Semitic people of the Tigro-Euphrates Valley were closely allied' (p. 36). As the Semitic mind is always shown to work towards simplification, and is characterised by a wonderful adaptability to surrounding manners, customs, and language, it seems hardly likely to Mr. Boscawen that the whole system of the cumbrous cuneiform writing, its elaborate syllabary, the use of polyphones, and the numerous ideograms, which are illustrated by inscribed records of every class, were the invention of the Semites (pp. 18, 19). Famine and trade were the two principal causes which led the Semites into Babylonia, and Semitic words were introduced into commercial and religious inscriptions as early as B.C. 4000. The comparison of these inscriptions with the language of the Old Testament shows the philological relationship between Assyrian and Hebrew, and furnishes fruitful results in the matter of derivations (p. 25). Mr. Boscawen gives many instances from the words of animal, domestic, and business life as An extract from a Chaldean deed throws light upon illustrations. the transaction of the Cave of Machpelah (p. 21). An inscription on a mace-head of Sargon I., of which a full-size photograph (facing p. 22) is given, shows that the Semites had begun to borrow from their Akkadian neighbours in B.C. 3800. The inscription on a tablet of Assur-nazir-pal I., B.C. 1800, or five centuries before the time of

them wonderfully rich in pure Semitic thought and religious aspirations.

Mr. Boscawen devotes his longest chapter to the Creation legends of the cuneiform inscriptions which have introduced a new

Moses, given, with a photograph, on pp. 32-4, contains many phrases of striking similarity to the Hebrew Psalms, and with this may be

compared the much later prayer of Nebuchadnezzar II., B.C. 606, and the prayer found on a clay cylinder translated on pp. 34-5, both of s out.

therto

s, but

olume,

eneral

he has

gerous

ble to

de the

with a

a rich

duced

m the

at the

of the

in the

he full

uctory

shows

emitic

p. 36).

cation.

inding

o Mr.

riting,

nerous

class,

vlonia.

ous in-

iptions

results

life as

upon

ion on

(facing

w from

tablet

ime of

ohrases

nay be

of, and

eligious

reation

a new

factor into the field of Biblical criticism. First of all there is a brief account of Mr. George Smith's publication of the Babylonian legends which present such a close resemblance to the Mosaic account. The time has come for these legends to be put before the general reader, for not only have the first fragments been accurately translated by the leading Assyriologists of the world, but duplicates and additional fragments of earlier editions of these important texts have been found. A photograph of the first tablet faces p. 42, and the translation of the fifth and most important tablet of the series is placed side by side with the Hebrew account of the work of the fourth day (p. 49), to which its resemblance is striking; while the order of the Babylonian tablet is determined by a regular, established law of precedence in The boundary-stone laying out the scheme of the heavenly bodies. of Nebuchadnezzar I. (p. 53) adds important information on the signs of the zodiac. The priority of the moon over the sun affords many points of comparison between the Babylonian and Hebrew records, and forms quite a fascinating section of Mr. Boscawen's There are other points of interest on the name work (pp. 57-64). of Sinai, the Sabbath, and the making of man in God's 'image' (pp. 64, 67, 71). Mr. Boscawen's own conclusions on the date of these tablets are given on pp. 72-74. He then gives a photograph of two of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, the discovery of which proves not only that the cuneiform writing was in use nearly two hundred years before the time of Moses, but also that there were men in Canaan who could read and write, and to whom the literature of Babylon was accessible. This most interesting chapter concludes with descriptions of the two still older Creation legends of Eridu and Kutha (pp. 77, 82). Eridu was among the Babylonians pre-eminently the city of Wisdom, and it is interesting to find on one of its small grey tablets a striking series of similarities to that remarkable chapter of Proverbs to which St. Athanasius naturally turned for proof that the divine Logos cooperated with the Father and the Holy Ghost in the work of creation1

When Mr. Boscawen passes from the record of the Creation to the story of the Fall, he has more to tell than that different kinds of serpents held a considerable place in ancient religious systems as symbols both of wisdom and of evil.<sup>2</sup> He not only produces a photograph of a 'seal of the temptation' (facing p. 90), and reports the record of a garden guarded by 'Kerubim' in the shape of scorpion men and women, but he also gives the rendering of a fragment which speaks of a redeemer who defeats the Tempter and restores the fallen (pp. 89, 90). The idea is of course clothed in polytheistic and mythic language, but it is there. Not less remarkable, though much less important from a religious point of view, are the details which Mr. Boscawen collects to illustrate the account of the beginnings of civilization given in the

<sup>1</sup> Prov. viii. 22-31.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The student of Ante-Nicene history will recollect the Ophite sect of Gnosticism. Numerous ancient pictorial representations are described in The Migration of Symbols by Count d'Alviella. See his Index under 'Serpents.'

189

Bos

tion

was

Am

tell

172

be

sen

inv

insc

has

spic

On

OR

rese

pro

trac

is 1

can

whi

ing

Gre

bel

esp

Dr.

bel

ten

who

pro

ass

boo

froi

be wit

oth

obl

the

me

son

of

pas

Co

atte

wild

fourth chapter of Genesis. The story of Cain and Abel, the origin of music, the building of cities, the working of metals, and the position of women are among the topics discussed (pp. 92-105). 'Were' on p. 105 is a misprint for 'where' in line 14, and 'matriarcal' in line 8 surely should be 'matriarchal.'

In illustration of the Hebrew record of the Deluge in Genesis vi.-ix. Mr. Boscawen goes behind the versions of the Chaldean tradition preserved in the writings of Berosos, and recapitulates the story of the discovery which was made about twenty years ago by the late Mr. George Smith. He found the more ancient version of the original Chaldean inscription from which Berosos at least derived his account, and Mr. Boscawen gives a very lucid explanation of this inscription by photographs, translations printed in parallel columns with the Hebrew narrative, and running comments. The Ark in the Assyrian account is a ship, the provisioning of which is described in the tablet with more detail than in the Hebrew account. An extremely grand description is given of the culmination of the stormy season when the Deluge took place. The tablet specifies the mountain of Nizir as the resting-place of the Ark, a district in the table-land of Pamir, a little south of Mount Rowandiz. The dove, the swallow, and the raven are mentioned in the tablet in the incident of the sending forth of the birds, and there is a remarkable detailed agreement with the Hebrew in the account of the sacrifice of thanksgiving after the flood. It is an extremely significant fact that the rainbow is mentioned as a token of the covenant between God and Noah only in the Hebrew narrative, although the tablet refers to the bow itself in a very noble sentence: 'From afar Istar in her approach lifted up the great arches which Anu had made for his glory' (pp.

The subject of eschatology, with which Mr. Boscawen concludes, possesses even more complexities in Babylonian than in Egyptian literature. He finds it almost impossible to form any general conception of the Chaldean views on the future life, but he examines the teaching of the ancient schools of Eridu, Nipur, and Kutha, and gives extracts in illustration of animism, ghost theories, and 'The Mountain of the World,' a sort of Chaldean Olympus (pp. 147-53). This mythological typography fits in with Isaiah's description of Sheol in his denunciation of Babylon. A still more definite form is given to the under-world by a Tel-el-Amarna tablet described on pp. 155-7. Mr. Boscawen also gives extracts from the 'tablet of the descent of Istar into the under-world,' and says that 'there is, perhaps, no text in the whole range of Assyriological literature which contains so much matter of interest alike for the student of classical mythology and of the Bible as this inscription' (p. 163). The legend is connected with the weeping for Tammuz, and illustrates Ezek. viii. 14 and Jer. xxii. 18 among other passages. We can only refer to the paragraph which illustrates the Scriptural phrase 'the shadow of death' from the inscriptions (p. 166). Mr.

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah xiv. 9, 15.

Boscawen infers from the tablet of the descent of Istar—with hesitation because the evidence is incomplete—that the Babylonian Hades was regarded as a place of punishment. From another Tel-el-Amarna tablet, and from a hymn of the late age of Assurbanipal, he tells us something of the corresponding conception of heaven (pp. 172, 175), and considers that only one parallel text, Ps. xvi. 16, can be quoted with any certainty from the Old Testament. The last sentence on p. 146 seems to us to be hopelessly ungrammatical and involved; but a more interesting and lucid account of ancient inscriptions, taken as a whole, we have never read, and Mr. Boscawen has transmuted his learning into popular forms of speech with conspicuous success.

Origines Judaice. An Inquiry into Heathen Faiths as affecting the Birth and Growth of Judaism. By W. F. Cobb. (London: Innes and Co., 1895.)

ORTHODOX believers need not be at all alarmed because the researches of the Higher critics and of Orientalists have undoubtedly proved that it has pleased God to use some elements which can be traced to heathen sources in making His revelation to man. There is no difficulty about this to a man who can appreciate the significance of a whole series of facts in the history of the Christian Church which shows that words and methods were taken from their surroundings and, as it were, baptized into Catholic service—for example, the Greek word μυστήριον and the Latin sacramentum. It is easy to believe that the same process went on in God's earlier revelation, especially if we believe in that operation of the Holy Spirit which Dr. Liddon called 'the inspiration of selection,' and if we recognize the true sense in which God is immanent in all His works. (For belief in this immanence in its widest sense Mr. Cobb invents the term Menotheism, p. 3.) All material things belong to God, and when He consecrates them to nobler ends Christian people see a process at work in harmony with the miracle at Cana, and with the assimilation of the broiled fish and the honeycomb into the glorified body of the Risen Saviour. Mr. Cobb approaches his investigation from this Christian point of view, and describes his main motive to be the endeavour to show that menotheism was the creed of Canaan with which the Jews were faced. The illustrations borrowed from other religions are subsidiary in their application. Mr. Cobb is obliged to begin by discussing the place of the Jews in history. If there was an old puritan view of the Jews as 'divine puppets mechanically set in action,' we ought to beware of the tendency of some modern critics to forget that they occupied a unique position of monotheistic grandeur, emphatically recognized in an inspired passage, and not forgotten by Mr. Cobb (p. 37). It also falls in Mr. Cobb's way to expose 'the dangers that attend all thorough-going attempts to convert the Bible narratives into pure myths' (p. 45), and in doing this he selects some specimens which vie with the wildest fancies of second-century Gnosticism, and should hardly be compared, even in an argumentum ad hominem, with St. Gregory's

XUM

igin of osition re' on cal' in

Jan.

enesis an traes the by the of the lerived of this olumns in the lin the

in the remely season tain of and of wallow, of the agree-sgiving ainbow I Noah the bow oproach ry' (pp.

cludes, gyptian general kamines ha, and d 'The 47-53). otion of form is d on pp. t of the there is, iterature student (p. 163). nd illuses. We

criptural

6). Mr.

550

1

le

M

of

OI

ev

ra

th

Je

an

he

te

in

PI

lin

fai

rel

ma

WO

the

is :

vai

car

the

ful

wh

fel

wh

Ma

interpretation of the Book of Job (p. 59). The application of the word 'myth' to the ante-patriarchal records in the Bible has been made with very different intentions, as Mr. Cobb shows; and if we are not disposed to accept the theories to which Mr. Cobb inclines, we acknowledge that he has given a good historical account of the varied treatment of what is called Hebrew mythology. Like some eminent preachers, Mr. Cobb has, to our mind, spent too much time in the porch of his subject, and we have to pass by a long chapter on the evolution of the religious idea (pp. 68-114) before we reach the chapters on ancestor worship, on solar worship, on serpent and tree worship, and on phallic worship. We have some wholesome criticism of Mr. Herbert Spencer's view that ancestor worship is the germinating cause of all religion (p. 115), allusions to the large part which it played in the religion of Egypt (p. 121), and the small part in the Assyrian and Phœnician systems (p. 127). The Jews, it is inferred, were less affected by Egyptian beliefs than is sometimes supposed. Mr. Cobb does not need to say very much about solar worship in general, but he has an important task before him when he endeavours to ascertain the earlier nature of the Hebrews' conception of the character of God, and the exact meaning attached to Baal worship in the Old Testament (p. 138). This is a careful piece of work, and is chiefly valuable because it shows that 'the history of the Jewish religion . . . is the record of the slow harmonization of the two ideas of God as stern and of God as the lifegiver, and their final emergence into the idea of God as at once tender and holy' (p. 163). Serpent worship, usually connected with the worship of trees, seems to have prevailed among all nations of Turanian birth, and among other people who fell under Turanian influence. There are even some traces in Druidical ruins which seem to some authorities to suggest that the serpent entered into Druids' rites (p. 176). Mr. Cobb's account of the prevalence of the serpent and the tree in religious worship and symbolism is interesting not only in connexion with the story of the Fall (p. 200), which in spite of Mr. Cobb we regard as an 'historical occurrence' (p. 201), and with the seven words used in the Old Testament for the serpent (p. 197), but also from its connexion with many legends and customs. Among these are the now harmless and almost obsolete maypole (p. 194) and apparently some of the more extravagant medieval legends about the true cross (p. 195). The chapter on phallic worship is inserted by Mr. Cobb under a strong sense of duty. It would be, he considers, derogatory to the dignity of truth to pass over unnoticed this branch of ancient worship; and although such writers as Professor Maspero and Mr. Baring-Gould have passed by it, Mr. Cobb thinks that it is impossible to give any faithful picture of ancient belief and worship if this is omitted (p. 207). It is a chapter only for the student, and although the book becomes by its presence unsuited for general circulation, Mr. Cobb has written it with all possible reserve. It was right to include some account of these customs, because there are some crazy latitudinarians who have pushed their studies in comparative theology to unreasonable

XUM

Jan.

the

been

d if

Cobb

ac-

tho-

nind,

pass

114)

ship,

some

estor

sions

121),

127).

an is

nuch

efore

ining

s is a that

e life-

once

ns of

anian

vhich

linto

of the

esting

ch in

201),

rpent

toms.

ypole

liæval

would

over

vriters

t, Mr.

ire of

napter

s pre-

en it

who

nable

lengths, and have ignored the presence of degrading and repugnant customs in many, if not all, heathen systems. These customs, Mr. Cobb observes, 'occupy a much larger place in the history of religion than most people would suppose from the current books on the subject' (p. 238). How far 'patriarchal simplicity saw no evil where we see nothing but what is shameful' it is perhaps impossible to say, but we venture to think that Mr. Cobb rather overrates this primitive innocence. The concluding chapter is devoted to the consideration of some disconnected facts which arise out of the Old Testament narrative, and Mr. Cobb collects some instructive details to show that the Cherubim over the Ark, the Urim and Thummim, the Ark itself, and a few other objects connected with Jewish worship had their earlier analogues in heathen religions. In an appendix Mr. Cobb discusses Dr. Driver's contention about Deuteronomy with favour, but with certain limitations (p. 275), and he compares with the lofty monotheism of Deuteronomy the text of a stele of an Assyrian officer which throws light on the religious temper of the time of Tiglath Pileser. An index makes reference easy, and, although Mr. Cobb frequently fails to convince us, we are much interested by the facts which he has accumulated and the form in which he has presented them to us.

Philo and Holy Scripture; or, The Quotations of Philo from the Books of the Old Testament. With Introduction and Notes. By HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Professorial Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ripon. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

Professor Ryle's alternative description of his book imposes a limit upon its main title, and excludes two topics concerning the writings of Philo Judæus with which New Testament students are familiar-the exact sense in which he used the term Logos, and the relation of his language to that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It may fairly be urged that both those fields of study have been well explored, while Philo's use of the Old Testament has not hitherto been illustrated by any collection of his quotations which gives their text in full. There have been, it is true, some diligent labourers at work to whom Professor Ryle confesses his obligations. Hornemann's Observationes, published in 1776, and now rare, has been the foundation of all subsequent inquiries into Philo's writings. It is an important, though a fragmentary, work (pp. xxvii, xlvii). variations of Philo's quotations from the text of the LXX have been carefully investigated by C. Siegfried (pp. xxxv, xlvii). But when these writers, and the authors of a few other articles, have had their full due, there is a wide margin left for the praise of Professor Ryle, who has done his work with great care and fulness, and has saved fellow-labourers in the same field from much of the tedious drudgery which the sifting and investigation of such materials involve. Canon Mangey's text of 1742 is used for the quotations, and other authorities

1 Liddon's Bampton Lectures, p. 62, 8th ed.

€Ů

ne

in

fie

ho

Si

in

th

wl fo

hi

ju:

fal

hi

be

th

lav wi

Be

tic

co

sto

SO

Gr for

tes

an

lea Dr

au

the

CO

sia

H

employed are described at the close of the Introduction (p. xlvi). Philo's attitude towards the Old Testament is to be gathered first of all from the phrases in which he alludes to their sacred and inspired character. Professor Ryle gives a few examples (p. xvi), and truly observes that it would be easy to multiply them to an almost unlimited extent. The great mass of Philo's quotations (pp. 1-282) were drawn from the Pentateuch, or, as he repeatedly called it, 'The Legislation.' The rest of the Old Testament quotations are all included in pp. 283-302. He 'lavishes every variety of eulogy' upon Moses as the 'writer of the sacred books and as the prophet-founder of the Israelite Law' (p. xvii). Professor Ryle gives one passage (p. xix) in which he thinks that Philo appears to include the book of Joshua in 'The Legislation,' but suggests (p. xxv) that this was 'through a slip of the memory.' He reviews the quotations from each book, and notices those books which are not quoted in their bearing upon the question of canonicity (p. xxxi). It is important to observe that 'Philo makes no quotations from the Apocrypha' (pp. xxxiii. 303), and that the supposed references are in reality the words or phrases which have been illustrated from the Apocrypha in the footnotes of Mangey's edition (p. xxxv), which have sometimes been ascribed to Philo himself. This is a good instance of Professor Ryle's way of patient investigation of error down to its roots. At the foot of the same page he corrects another mistake, and on the next page administers a delicate rebuke to the borrower of an unacknowledged quotation. But on p. 305 he has to record a fruitless search for a reference. In accounting for the variations in the quotations from the text of the LXX, Professor Ryle considerably simplifies Siegfried's classification. He ascribes them to the methods of Philo's teaching, his disregard for verbal accuracy, the variety of early Greek renderings and readings, and errors in the existing text The second of these causes, as Professor Ryle admits, is common to the writers of that age. In an age of printing, with every facility for turning readily to chapter and verse, we can hardly appreciate the difficulties of verbal accuracy in Philo's age, although the reluctance of verifying quotations has not ceased with our facilities for the process. We are not quite satisfied with the note on Philo's formulæ of quotation (p. xlv). It is said in the case of φησί that it cannot be determined whether the subject be Moses or Scripture personified (cf. also p. xxv). A third alternative is possible, and although Professor Ryle does not mention it, we believe that δ Θεὸς, the inspirer of Holy Writ, is the true subject of φησί. The student is assisted by footnotes and a full index to quotations.

Italy and her Invaders. Volumes V. and VI. By THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. Oxford and Durham, Litt. D. Dublin, Fellow of University College, London. With Maps and Illustrations. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.)

It rarely happens that an author can satisfy the trained historical student and the general reader at the same time, but this is the aim of Dr. Hodgkin, and his effort seems to us to be crowned with xlvi).

irst of

pired

truly

t un-

-282) 'The

ıll inupon under

ssage

book

is was

from

their ortant

ty the

ha in

fessor

. At

on the

n un-

uitless

n the

erably

thods

ety of

g text

nits, is

, with

nardly

hough

h our

ote on

f φησί

es or

ssible, e that

The

OGKIN,

ow of

ations.

torical ne aim

1 with

triumphant success. His great work is approaching its conclusion without any diminution of the almost stately grandeur which is enhanced by all the best work of the Clarendon Press. There is the same dignified exercise of historical judgment, the same pleasant witty phrases which Aristotle would have classed under the head of εὐτραπελία; the same delightful power of telling stories, enlivening but not unduly interrupting the narrative, which Dr. Hodgkin displayed in the earlier volumes. And all these literary gifts are devoted to a field of historical inquiry in which Dr. Hodgkin, by general consent, holds the first place. The two volumes now before us comprise the sixth and seventh 'books' of the work, and deal with the Lombard invasion and kingdom. They contain, in other words, the history of the two centuries which extend from the expulsion of the Goths from Italy to the death of the Lombard king Liutprand. It is a period in which the historian has to depend upon meagre and fragmentary information, but which demands a large amount of space for the history of the Franks and for Papal affairs, because, as Dr. Hodgkin justly observes, the next scene has the Frankish king and the Roman Pontiff for its chief actors. Their co-operation brought about the fall of the Lombard kingdom and changed the face of Italy, and the history of this united achievement will form the burden of what will be, alas! Dr. Hodgkin's last volume. The author kindly enumerates the chapters which are more particularly suited to the specialist. They are those which deal, almost exhaustively, with the Lombard laws, with the official machinery of the exarchate of Ravenna, and with the Istrian schism. This last subject will interest both the theologian and also the student of the early history of Venice. Besides alluding to the general excellence of the maps and illustrations, special mention ought to be made, in the interests of students of numismatology, of the valuable note and plate on the Lombard coinage prepared by Mr. H. A. Grueber. We could linger long over the attractive and varied details of the

We could linger long over the attractive and varied details of the story, but we must content ourselves with some references to Dr. Hodgkin's treatment of the lives of two great men whose names call to mind how marvellously various are the characters of the Church's sons—St. Gregory the Great and St. Columban. The chapters on Gregory, 'the last of the great Romans of the Empire, the true founder of the Mediæval Papacy,' are practically the heart of the fifth volume (pp. 279-453). The life of Gregory supplies a good test of Dr. Hodgkin's work, because here comparison is possible, and the other writers on the theme are numbered among not the least but the greatest ecclesiastical authors.\(^1\) We mourn because Dr. Hodgkin has not included Bede's short sketch among his authorities. His reason that Bede's 'contribution relates solely to the mission to Britain' (p. 280) does not convey at all an accurate impression of the chapter 'de obitu beati papæ Gregorii,' which contains information about Gregory's ancestors, his life as 'apocrisiarius' in Constantinople, his literary labours, and other matters

<sup>1</sup> Add to the works of standard historians the remarks in Newman's Historical Sketches, i. 130, and compare Church Quarterly Review, No. 23. VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII. O O

0

li

w

p

ec

C

SC

D

sh

of

of

th

ro

ine

an

TI

IT

sty

In

Th

as

app

lad

in

to

fine

stu

life

lead

Sco

dog

(p.

plic

brig

a ri

not.

which Bede had received, as he is careful to observe, 'ab antiquis.' 1 Dr. Hodgkin has produced some very useful work on the fourteen books of Gregory's Epistles, which he very properly regards as the best authority for his life and describes as 'a vast quarry out of which the student of early mediæval history may hew almost endless material' (p. 307). No doubt there are some qualities in the letters of St. Cyprian and St. Basil which are not to be found in those of St. Gregory, but after all St. Gregory's great collection, from the position of the author and his ceaseless direction of ecclesiastical affairs in all parts of the world, stands alone. Dr. Hodgkin shows by some well-chosen samples how the Epistles illustrate Gregory's care of the extensive patrimony of St. Peter in the double burden of its receipts and expenditure, his work as Metropolitan of the West in Africa, Sardinia, Gaul, Spain, and in England as 'our father who sent us baptism,' and his liturgical reconstructions. A fuller treatment of the services which Gregory rendered to the worship of the Church at large by his knowledge of liturgies and his love of music is felt to be desirable, but the subject perhaps lay too far off Dr. Hodgkin's main path. The student must not fail to pay special attention to note F (p. 333), on the letters of St. Gregory, in which some help is given on the difficult question of their chronology, with an account of Ewald's 'exceedingly minute and critical examination' of them, unhappily cut short by his death, and some particulars concerning the various editions. We do not for a moment desire to justify the sad letter in which Gregory congratulated Phocas on the fall of Maurice, but our readers may think that Dr. Hodgkin is unnecessarily severe upon it (p. 443), and that he allows the unhappy incident to disturb the calmness of his very finely written estimate of the Pope's character.

'On the whole, it seems safer to judge him as a great Roman than as a great saint;—and thus considered, his generosity, his justice, his courage, entitle him to a high place among the noblest names of his imperial race. In estimating his character we must never forget that, during all his public life, he was almost incessantly tortured by disease' (p. 452).

When we turn from Gregory to Columban we cannot help regretting that we are obliged to pass by Dr. Hodgkin's survey of the seventh century, a century dear to every English Churchman. Much too could be said upon the story of the four great duchies of Trient, Friuli, Benevento, and Spoleto, upon the excellent treatment of the legislation of Rothari and Liutprand, upon the beginnings of Iconoclasm in the eighth century, and upon the political state of imperial and of Lombard Italy. We have, however, Dr. Hodgkin's own high authority to back us up when we say that the life of St. Columban has a unique importance which claims our attention before all else in the sixth volume. After relating the beginnings of the great monastic house of Bobbio, and justifying himself for spending so long a time over the life of its founder, Dr. Hodgkin proceeds—

'There can be little doubt that the Monastery of Bobbio, even more

<sup>1</sup> Bede, ii. 1.

than the holiness and popularity of Queen Theudelinda, was the means of accomplishing that conversion of the Lombards to the Catholic form of Christianity, which at last, though not in the first or second generation, ended the religious duality of Italy' (pp. 133-4).

The chapter which is devoted to St. Columban presents us with a vivid picture of the great Irish missionary, within the scholarly walls of the monastery of Bangor (p. 111), holding mysterious communion, like another St. Francis, with the beasts of the field (p. 119); dealing with royal wickedness, after the manner of St. John the Baptist (p. 121); preaching the Gospel with his brave companion St. Gall (p. 127); and personally assisting in the building work of the monastery on the banks of the Bobbio (p. 133). Dr. Hodgkin does not forget to dwell on Columban's love of classical literature, common to the great Irish ecclesiastics of the age (p. 135), and while he gives the letters of Columban to Popes Gregory and Boniface IV. he expresses a scholar's regret that Gregory's reply has not come down to us (pp. 116-7, 139-42). In spite of Celtic fervour, austerity, and scholarship, Columban's life and rule only supply another emphatic instance of the failure of Celtic in the presence of the imperial organization 'Little more than fifty years after his death of Roman Christianity. the white scapular of Columbanus was disappearing before the black robe of Benedict' (p. 147). The reader will be glad to find a good index and a glossary of Lombard words (p. 635). Beyond a slight defect of type in a footnote (v. 307) we have observed no misprint of any kind.

The Old Missionary. By SIR WILLIAM W. HUNTER, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D. (Oxford and London: Henry Frowde, 1895.)

It is possible to put in a very few words all that needs to be said about this short shilling story. That it is written in a charming style, and that it gives a vivid sketch of some circumstances of Indian life, is to be expected as soon as the author's name is known. The first chapter is marked by these two characteristics, and serves as an introduction to the account of the missionary himself, who appears in the second chapter. Having been a midshipman as a lad, he is transformed by some unrecorded process into a missionary in later life. We are told, however, that the missionary idea occurred to him while reading Captain Cook's voyages (p. 34), and that, after finding what is strangely called 'Evangelism' unsatisfactory, he studied surgery, fell under the influence of Irving, advanced in later life beyond this phase, and became the spiritual and temporal leader of the hillmen. Finally, we are told that 'he remained a Scotch Episcopalian, as his forefathers had been; but with no strong dogmas, and only a great daily desire to do the best for his people' The story of his influence among the hillmen, the simplicity of his domestic life, and his grave, deep affection for his bright little daughter is told with much pathos; and it is hard to read two or three pages without finding some sentence which shows a ripe knowledge of Indian life. Would that this were all, but it is not. Gifts of literary style and knowledge of Indian affairs are not

002

is.' 1 teen

hich rial' rian but thor

nony e, his pain, gical

egory ge of bject must ers of on of

on of inute leath, o not contthink

that

than ce, his of his t that,

lp reof the
Much
Trient,
of the
lgs of
ate of
lgkin's
of St.
before
of the
ending

n more

C

lo

(

ti

re

aj

ha

th

pa

th

m

pu he

TI

wh

sul

Bis

be

pre

des

car

hea

rea

Co

Ch

Un

live

sim

sia

incompatible with an inability to understand the solemn duty of the Church to hand on the severity as well as the tenderness of her Lord, and Sir William Hunter has woven a passage into his narrative which utterly fails to grasp the sense in which the Church repeats the language of the Quicunque vult. It is suggested, in the first place, that the desire of the catechist to recite the Athanasian Creed on Trinity Sunday arose from the discordant teaching of 'a High Church young parson of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,' and was fanned into a flame 'amid the excitements of the Whitsun week, with its Ember days' (p. 104). This is put in a very unworthy and insinuating manner, if Sir William Hunter is at all aware that the recitation of the Athanasian Creed is commanded by the law of the Book of Common Prayer, and is not a fad of any particular school of thought. The passage also cuts at a missionary society which deserves the deepest respect of all true lovers of India, and appears to betray a complete ignorance of the character and object of the Ember days. The missionary's reply to the request will be read with extreme regret by many who owe a debt of gratitude to Sir William Hunter for his luminous writings on our Indian empire: "So long as I live," replied the old missionary slowly, and with a solemn emphasis on each word, "the Church in which I have preached Christ's message of mercy shall never be profaned by man's dogma of damnation" (p. 105). We are familiar with this form of the objection to the Creed among the ignorant and unthinking members of our flocks, but it is new to us to find that it should have favour with a writer who is capable of examining the original Latin words of the Creed, who ought to be familiar with the Church's repeated explanations of her own language, who knows that the language of the Creed is simply the reflexion of Holy Scripture, and who can appreciate the argument that the more merciful is Christ's message the greater is the peril of rejecting it. It was not harshness but the truest kindness when our Lord said, 'Without Me ye can do nothing,' when the Apostles preached Christ as the only Saviour of men, and when the Church cast into 'the Creed of the Saints and anthem of the blest' the truth that if a man keeps not the trust of the Catholic faith when it has been committed to him, but casts it away and weaves for himself some other theory of salvation and holds thereto unto the end, without doubt he shall perish everlast-Yet another passage is there which ought to be severely criticized, in which the Creed is called 'a creed compiled centuries after the death of the man whose name it bears, a creed passed over in silence by most of the Christian sects, and by the majority of our own Church in America and in Ireland. How can you (a young Brahmin deacon) look around you at the good lives and patient endurance of millions of your countrymen, and dare to assert they will perish everlastingly?' It is only because a copy of The Old Missionary is said to be lying on many drawing room tables, where it may be illogically supposed that Sir William Hunter must be reliable as a theological controversialist because he is a great authority on India, that it is worth while to answer such pitiful talk as

MUX

Jan.

the

her

arra-

urch

n the

asian

of 'a

f the

f the

in a

is at

nded

any

onary

ndia,

and

quest grati-

ndian

, and have

ed by

h this hink-

hould

iginal

urch's

t the

e, and hrist's

hness

e can

iviour Saints

trust

casts

n and

erlast-

verely

turies

d over

of our

young

patient

rt they

he Old

where ust be

autho-

talk as

the above. It ought not to be necessary to tell Sir William Hunter that 'Athanasian' Creed means the Creed which accurately expresses the Catholic Faith of the Holy Trinity and Incarnation for which St. Athanasius lived and died. Any one who has read even only Gibbon, from whom Sir William Hunter appears to derive his theology (p. 121), knows that the epithet used in common speech for the Quicunque vult is correctly applied. As for 'most of the Christian sects,' we do not know what right any sects have to the name of Christian when they have given up belief in any part of the Christian revelation of God's being and character and gracious process of redemption; and the history of the sects shows that decay in belief appears as soon as the Creed is 'passed over in silence.' It is hardly according to the probable practice of the Irish clergy to say that the majority of our own Church in America and in Ireland pass the Creed over in silence, when the Creed itself is printed in the Book of Common Prayer published by the authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, although the rubric enjoining its use on fixed days is omitted. Lastly, no one who repeats the language of the Creed makes any declaration whatever about the millions of his fellow-countrymen who have never received the full Catholic Faith, and we can only suppose that Sir William Hunter puts some meaning upon the language of the Creed which the Church herself repudiates. We refer him and any other persons who are likely to be misguided by him to the explanation of the language of the Creed put forth by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1879.

A Pastoral Letter from the Right Reverend C. W. Sandford, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co., 1895.)

THE Bishop of Gibraltar's Pastoral Letter is full of sound doctrine, wholesome and necessary for these times. It shows how greatly the subject of reunion engrosses the thoughts of Christians when the Bishop devotes nearly one-half of his letter to a discussion of the prospects of reunion, and of our duty in this respect. The Bishop begins his letter by setting forth in telling sentences the evils of our present unhappy divisions, and his words leave no doubt that a real desire for union dominates his heart; but he sees, as, indeed, no one can help seeing, the enormous difficulties which lie in the way of any healing of the schism. But 'with God nothing shall be impossible.'

On p. 27 there are a few sentences which we should like to be read by those who complain of the presence of English clergy on the Continent, and who imagine that reunion would render English chapels and English priests unnecessary. The Bishop says—

'These services are a necessity in the present divided state of Christendom. Even should our prayers be granted, and all Christian

<sup>1</sup> See also Hooker, v. 42, 1; Lyra Apostolica, No. 115; Liddon, University Sermons, ii. 119; Dean Butler's sermon The Faith once delivered to the Saints; and an extremely valuable little work, couched in simple language, by the Rev. J. H. Rawdon, M.A., entitled The Athanasian Creed.

people of every land be united once more, Englishmen would continue to need religious services conducted in their own language. The chief difference that reunion would make in this matter would be that before we provided independently for our own religious wants, we should apply to the ecclesiastical authorities of the country to sanction our ministrations.

This is not always remembered. English residents in a foreign country would as certainly need English chapels as the French residents in London need a Notre-Dame de France in Leicester Square, served by French clergy, while all the time they are surrounded by English Roman Catholic chapels and English Roman Catholic priests. How can an English priest receive the confession of a Frenchman, or preach an edifying sermon in the French language? Each nation must naturally have clergy of its own race and language, even as it insists on having its own physicians and surgeons. The Bishop speaks on these subjects with the authority of great experience, and his utterances on the subject of reunion are the more worthy of study since they proceed from one having a long and intimate acquaintance with foreign Churches and foreign lands.

Any attempt at proselytizing or creating separate societies of Christians the Bishop looks upon with dislike (p. 24), and he will not countenance the chaplains who hold his license in any such efforts. The latter half of the *Pastoral Letter* contains an interesting account of the exchange of courtesies between the Bishop and the heads of the orthodox Churches in the East; and the good feelings which happily now exist throughout the East towards the Church of England are, no doubt, as the Bishop tells us, due in great measure to the cessation of the interference which in former times sometimes took place.

The Bishop's journeys and labours are truly apostolic, and the hardships gone through in perils on the sea as well as perils in the wilderness must try any constitution. We trust the Bishop's health has received no permanent injury from his being snowed up for two days and nights on the French frontier when returning from Spain during the severe winter of last year.

In conclusion we would, venture to notice, without being able altogether to approve, 'a shortened prayer for the Queen's Majesty and for all in authority.' Why not use the old form? And can the Bishop, by law, direct the use of such a form, especially in churches built and consecrated for service according to the Use of the Church of England? And do we not pray in the Church militant for all Christian kings, princes, and governors, so that no special form seems needed, like that given on p. 57? Now, when every clergyman does that which is right in his own eyes, it is an encouragement to the lawless to find a bishop using and enjoining new forms of prayer other than those in the Book of Common Prayer; and better it seems hopeless in these days to attempt to construct.

n

0

ir

a

Jan.

nue to

chief

istra-

reign resijuare,

ed by

riests.

man,

nation

as it

Bishop

e, and

study

tance

ies of

ill not

efforts.

count

ads of

which

igland

to the

took

d the

in the

health

or two

Spain

g able

lajesty

an the

urches

hurch

for all

seems n does

to the

prayer

secms

Annual Report of the Gibraltar Mission to Seamen in the Mediterranean. (London: T. Brettell and Co., 1895.)

THE Report of the Gibraltar Mission for 1895 tells us of continued activity during the past year, of 'improvement in the quality as well as progress in the extent of the work,' and of the establishment of a Sailors' Guild, which, by a sense of fellowship, will encourage the sailors in their efforts to lead a Christian life. 'Temperance work' is given a prominent place in the Report; but we are not told what 'Temperance work' is; we should be glad if it were defined, for both the Report itself and the reports of the chaplains annexed make us suspect that it may be only the wholesale signing of the pledge under something very like compulsion. The Report from Gibraltar contains these ominous words, placed in the forefront of the document: '553 men have signed the pledge during the year. The hardest to persuade was a young Scotchman; however, at the end of an hour's mingled remonstrance and entreaty, he signed.' At Nice the new caretaker is reported, first of all, to be 'a zealous temperance advocate,' and, secondly, only 'an earnest religious man.' At Genoa signing the pledge and joining the Seamen's Guild seem synonymous, which is corroborated by the Report from Palermo, where we are told that 130 have joined the Guild and 135 signed the pledge. Many of the reports, as might be expected, show sober, quiet work, free from fanaticism; and in the printed rules of the Guild there is nothing to suggest that total abstinence is a sine qua non of admission. Drunkenness is a loathsome and degrading vice, only too prevalent amongst sailors, and every legitimate means should be taken for its suppres-But we doubt very much if forcing upon men, in moments of excitement, a lifelong vow, certain in a large percentage not to be kept, is a legitimate method. If such a lifelong vow should ever be taken, it should be taken as a marriage vow is, 'discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God,' not at the point of a moral bayonet, or to be quit of the importunity of a missioner. Even in the Report of the Committee total abstinence seems to be considered the only entrance to the leading of a Christian and a godly life: it tells us with approval that certain officers and engineers 'threw all the whiskey in their possession overboard,' treating this innocent creature of God as if it were 'the devil in solution.' This is the action of Manichees, not of Christians; of fanatics, not of sober members of the Church of England; and we are sure that the Gibraltar Mission would more readily gain the confidence of orthodox Churchmen if a promiscuous signing of the pledge were not made so prominent a part in the work of its agents.

Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungariæ. Cura et impensis Josephi Dankó. (Budapestini: arte chalcotypa in ædibus Franklinianis descriptum, 1893.)

When the Latin hymns which are the glory of the Missal and Breviary became known to the generation before this, the discovery of so great a heritage led men, not unnaturally, to think that every

18

L

th

lo

th

die

E

da

TI

ra

ou

T

ad

on

A

be

ma

ca

ch

an

eit

mo

is,

Er

wh

ce

St.

aft

rec

in

M

tio

CO

WC

the

en

as

thi

car

the

an

sai

Bo

Latin hymn must be a treasure, to be got out of manuscript into print as quickly as possible. Now, as in everything else, the reaction has come, partly due, it may be, to the extravagant praise bestowed on Adam of St. Victor by Dr. Neale; and we find that every Latin hymn is not on a level with Veni sancte Spiritus or Dies ira. The output of Latin hymns of late years has become positively alarming. The Sequences printed by Messrs. Weale and Misset no longer attract attention, perhaps because Analecta Liturgica itself appears at such long intervals; but Pater Dreves continues to pour forth volume after volume of Hymni Inediti, of which no less than nineteen tomes have already appeared. Nor do the Latin hymns in the book before us make us reconsider the opinion that the mine is pretty well exhausted, and that all the gold has long ago been dug out. The editor has brought together a number of hymns from manuscript and early printed liturgical books of the Church of Hungary. From such a corner of Eastern Europe it might have been thought that a number of new hymns might be rescued. Testing them, however, by the first part (A to K) of Chevalier's Repertorium Hymnologicum, we fail to find more than a dozen or so unrecorded by this most diligent collector. Some, indeed, here printed are in rare printed books, almost as inaccessible as manuscripts; such are several of the hymns from Missale Zagrabiense (Agram) of 1511, a copy of which we have seen in the Barberini Library at Rome, but no nearer. The best of these rarer hymns may be that on p. 306, Decantemus congaudentes, for Michaelmas. A good part of the book is taken up by curious versifications of anthems and responds for the feasts of saints honoured by the Magyars; and we learn with considerable interest that to this day in the Church of Hungary there survives the system of farcing, so common amongst ourselves in the Middle Ages, of which the late Mr. Henry Bradshaw thought that the Ten Commandments in the Communion Service of the Prayer Book were a survival as a farced Kyrie. There are still used in Hungary, apparently, farced Kyrie's for all the year round; a farced Sanctus and Ite missa est are also printed.

At the end of the book two interesting monuments of the Church of Gran are printed—one a calendar of the fourteenth century, the other an ordinary of the fifteenth century. The former contains fewer local saints than we should have expected. St. George is kept, not on April 23, but on April 24, as may be noticed in many German calendars, and SS. Vedast and Amandus are kept not on February 6 or June 4, July 2 and 15, September 30 or October 1, but on an unusual date, October 27. The ordinary is full of customs which will delight the ceremonialist. One is the Easter sepulchre, of which we hear so much in England. It is said that the present Pope has authorized this custom in the Church of Hungary, so that there is no prospect of its being 'reformed' away at present. The book concludes with an index of the hymns printed, and we think on the

whole that its existence is justified.

Jan.

into

tion

wed

atin

The

ing.

nger

rs at

ume

mes

fore

ex-

The

and such

ever,

cum,

nost

nted

l of

y of

arer.

mus

n up

s of

the

iges,

om-

re a

ppa-

and

urch

the

tains

kept,

man

ary 6

n an

of

Pope

here

book

i the

The Parishioner's Almanack for 1896. (London: S.P.C.K.)
 The Churchman's Almanack for 1896. (London: S.P.C.K.)

3. The Churchman's Almanack for 1896, for Use in the Prayer Desk. (London: S.P.C.K.)

LAST Epiphany twelvemonth some of us were not pleased to find that the great festival of the Epiphany had been thrust down to a lower place in the Churchman's Almanack, and made to give way to the second Sunday after Christmas (a Sunday which in 1895 really did not exist), and that, instead of the service being wholly of the Epiphany, the S.P.C.K. had positively given a preference to the Sunday lessons (see the extra leaf at the end of the Almanack for 1894). This year we have looked over the almanacks supplied by the venerable Society, hoping to find some increased care in the editing. But our hopes have been disappointed. There is a new sheet almanack. The Parishioner's, printed attractively in colours, and with large additions to the number of saints commemorated. But as soon as one opened the sheet one's eye was caught by a misprint. April 30 there is St. 'Eickenwold' for Erkenwold; and a few lines below, on August 5, St. 'Aswold' for Oswald. There is no distinction made, by type or other means, between the saints of the Prayer Book calendar and those added by this private adventure. The task of choosing fresh names of saints for commemoration is one that an angel might tremble before, and we can hardly congratulate the editor either on his choice or on his knowledge. Saints unknown to the most learned hagiographers are inserted; and the information given is, to say the least, curious. Why, if St. Vitalis is to appear in an English calendar on April 28, should his date be given as A.D. 1050, when he is usually assigned to the reign of Nero, a church being certainly built in his honour at Ravenna in the time of Justinian? St. Polycarp is placed on the day before, April 27, with A.D. 169 set after. In most martyrologies Polycarp is kept on January 26, and recent researches agree neither with the year nor with the day given in the almanack. Running the eye down a little, we come to St. Magnus, martyr, on August 19, who suffered in the Decian persecution; but the S.P.C.K. almanack knows better, and puts '9th century' in brackets after his name. And if all these blunders are contained in a space a little over that of a square inch, how many would there be if the same inquiry were extended over the whole of the calendar? This editor of the Society's is a rival to him who entered St. Gregory the Great in one year's Churchman's Almanack as 'Gregory, Martyr, Bishop of Rome, and Confessor.' The only good thing in the compilation of this list of saints is that St. Joseph cannot be found anywhere in January, March, April, or December, the months in which this wandering saint may sometimes be found in ancient and modern calendars.

With the Churchman's Almanack we feel more at home; for the saints in the calendar would seem to be only those in the Prayer Book. Yet it would be just as well if the calendar of the 'Book annexed' were taken as a guide rather than any later and unauthorized copy. For example, the 'Book annexed' has on October 17 only

18

TE

L

0

to

St

el

T

al

SI

a

0

18

0

pa

le

Ί

is

q

0

p

W

ir D N

q

b

cl

k

ai

W

O

I.

R

'Ethelrede, Virgin,' while the S.P.C.K. in all its calendars has 'Etheldreda, Virgin, Queen, and Abbess of Ely.' If, too, the S.P.C.K. takes upon itself to alter the spelling of the names of saints, Gregorius being changed to Gregory, Hierome to Jerome, and the like, why should not Enurchus be altered into Evurcius, for which is plainly meant? or Gregorius, M., translated into Gregory the Great? The small edition of the Churchman's Almanack has solved the difficulty this year by leaving out the M. for Magnus altogether.

The want of responsible supervision of these almanacks, or even of some attention in reading the proofs, is shown in the notes on the liturgical colours both in the large sheet Churchman's Almanack and in the Churchman's Almanack for Use in the Prayer Desk. We are told in the former that red may be used (by those who follow the Sarum Rite) from Candlemas to September. Now any person who had authority to correct the proofs ought to have had sufficient knowledge of his subject to have been aware that Septuagesima was intended, not September. And as for the liturgical colours given in the Churchman's Almanack for Use in the Prayer Desk they are a mass of confusion, of which it seems impossible to make head or tail, even after some study. We are reminded of the line—

'Your true no meaning puzzles most of all.'

They are arranged in two columns, headed R. and S., which are, no doubt, Rome and Sarum; but the results given seem to justify the opinion that they were drawn up by some clerk, equally innocent of Rome or Sarum, who had instructions to make the best job he could of the colours from some old calendars and almanacks which profess to give the information.

Throughout all the S.P.C.K. almanacks for this year we notice that precedence is given to Septuagesima over Candlemas. We know the Church of Rome does this; but it was not done in England before the Reformation. The Sarum and York rules are distinct, that Candlemas Day being a feast of Our Lord, a solemnitas Domini, the service is to be of Candlemas, with a memoria of Septuagesima. The same direction is given in the table for the precedence of feasts in the Convocation Prayer Book. The directions of the S.P.C.K. almanacks show as little attention and consistency in the directions for the falling together of feasts as in the liturgical colours and the hagiography.

This is not the sort of work that a society like the S.P.C.K. ought to put forth. We find no attempt to secure anything like first-rate authority on the subjects on which it speaks. All is hazard, slipshod, inaccurate; and even when the substance of the information is exact the almanacks are disfigured by printer's errors, which are not due to the printer so much as to carelessness in revising the proofs. If the S.P.C.K. is to retain the confidence of its subscribers, it must make a radical change in its methods.

Essays and Studies. By John Churton Collins. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

Four of the papers contained in this volume (we would not undertake to say which are 'essays' and which are 'studies') are articles

has reprinted from the Quarterly Review, dealing respectively with C.K. 'Dryden,' 'The Predecessors of Shakspeare,' 'Lord Chesterfield's Letters,' and 'The Porson of Shakspearian Criticism' (videlicet, Theobald). The fifth, on 'Menander,' similarly appeared in the Cornhill Magazine in the days before that periodical gave itself up to sixpenny frivolity. Mr. Churton Collins affects the full-dress style of the old Quarterly and Edinburgh articles, and his essays are elaborate, substantial treatises on the subjects with which they deal. They contain ample information, wide knowledge of literary history, and deliberate critical judgment. No one with a taste for literature is likely to read them without interest and profit. But their substantial merits only render more aggravating the conspicuous faults which disfigure them, or, we might say, the conspicuous fault, since all are resolvable into one great defect of tone. Mr. Collins is so offensively cocksure. The cocksureness he shares with Macaulay, on whose style his writings appear to be modelled; the offensiveness is his own. Exaggerated epithets of either praise or blame, an ven in are a ostentatious display of acquaintance with the most obscure writers of past periods, a tone as of the 'superior person' in dealing with authors of whom he does not happen to approve—these faults, which all resolve themselves into a deficiency of taste, greatly mar the enjoyment of his readers. To give but one example, it is simply ead or grotesque to affirm (p. 264) that 'every man with any tincture of letters has by heart' the lines of the Dunciad which are devoted to Theobald. There are many men whose acquaintance with literature is both wide and deep, who yet possess but a small stock of verbal quotations. Phrases such as these do not affect the substantial value of the opinions expressed in these essays, but they destroy the notice pleasure of reading them, and can only be attributed to that kind of We want of taste which conceives effectiveness as synonymous with one in vehemence. An error of a kind which we should not have expected es are in Mr. Collins occurs on p. 52, where a well-known phrase of Dryden's is misquoted: 'Tis enough for one age to have neglected Mr. Cowley and starved Mr. Waller.' It is not so much the mismnitas ria of or the quotation that is remarkable, though the original letter may be seen

> Lectures and Essays. By SIR J. R. SEELEY, K.C.M.G., Litt.D. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

his own infirmities receive more than their due share of notice.

by every visitor to the British Museum, and a facsimile of it pur-

chased for threepence; but we should have expected Mr. Collins to

know that Waller did not die in a state of destitution, and that the author named by Dryden is Butler. In another person the slip

would be called a small one; but a writer who is so severe on the

errors and ignorance of others, and who delights so much in a parade

of minute literary knowledge, has only himself to thank if some of

It would be exaggeration to say that this volume of essays is very interesting; but, like all that Seeley wrote, it is readable and often suggestive. The most important part of it is the three essays on Roman Imperialism, in which the causes of the fall of the Republic and the Empire are in turn investigated. Seeley was always better

aints, l the ich it the olved her. even n the k and e are w the who ficient a was

Jan.

re, no ify the ent of could profess

ections istency urgical

P.C.K. e firsthazard, forma-, which ing the cribers,

don: underarticles

in analysing the characteristics of large periods and great movements than in depicting the characters of individuals, as the superiority of his Expansion of England to his Napoleon sufficiently shows; and his skill in the former kind of historical insight is here well exhibited. He could apply simple generalizations to long periods of time, and embrace a great range of history under a single principle. So here he represents the fall of the Roman Republic as due not to any great political or constitutional principle, but to the desire of the people for adequate defence against external enemies; and the fall of the Empire to the diminution of the birth-rate, which at last left no means of resisting this external pressure. Both points of view are rather different from those usually presented in histories, and, in the first instance, Seeley perhaps omits to lay sufficient stress on the popular desire for good internal administration as well as for external defence; but in both there is much truth, vividly set forth. third essay, on the Characteristics of the Byzantine Empire, is less convincing, and fails to do justice either to the Byzantine armies or to the services which the Byzantine Empire rendered to civilization by its maintenance of the Greek language and much of its literature against barbarian assaults, until the West was once more able to appreciate its value.

Of the remaining essays two are devoted to the politics and poetry of Milton, and the rest deal with various topics more or less connected with education. All were originally published in or before 1870; and, since educational controversies are constantly changing their point of view and their particular application, they are not so valuable or so interesting now as they were a quarter of a century ago. Much of the papers on 'Liberal Education in Universities' and 'The Church as a Teacher of Morality' is now antiquated, and only interesting to those who wish for a record of Seeley's personal views. On the other hand, the essay on 'English in Schools' is as much to the point now as ever, since the predominance of Latin over English as the standard medium of education is practically unaltered. We do not agree with either his depreciation of Latin or his high belief of the impression which the enforced study of good English literature would have upon the average schoolboy; but his arguments are at least suggestive, and have the useful property of making the reader think. And this may be said of the whole

volume.

ements ority of ; and ibited. e, and o here to any of the he fall ast left f view and, in

on the sternal The is less nies or ization erature ble to

poetry s conbefore anging not so entury rsities' d, and ersonal' is as Latin ctically Latin of good out his

erty of whole

## INDEX TO VOL. XLI.

ABA

BAILARD as a theological teacher, 129 sqq.: impediments to the investigation of Abailard's theology, 130; various editions of his works, ib.; what was the condemned treatise of Abailard? 132; origin of the Tractatus de Trinitate, 135; Roscelin, Abailard's teacher, 136; quarrel between them, 137; Abailard's view of the relation between reason and faith, 138; a supposed alteration of his view considered, 139; controversial motive of his chief theological works: mainly against Gilbert de la Porrée, 140; character and contents of the De Trinitate, 142; modified expression of his doctrine of Three Persons in the Godhead, 143; explanation of the anima mundi of the ancient philosophers, 144; Abailard's influence on the method of medieval theological study: his Sententia, 145; Father Denifle's account of the work, 146; its date, 147; evidence of the influence of Abailard's theology, 148; its method, 149; its influence on systematizing the Canon Law, ib. Almanacks, Church, published by the S.P.C.K., 561

Anglican Orders, 282 sqq.: revival of the old controversy: question of Barlow's consecration, 282; the condition of his three associates in consecrating Parker, 283; the form they used was valid, ib.; they acted as co-consecrators, 285; arguments in favour of Barlow's consecration, 286; Father S. Smith's rejoinder criticized, 288; the argument

BAL

founded on the absence of the record of Barlow's consecration, 289; the recently discovered Bull and Brief of Paul IV., 290; how Cardinal Pole treated Edwardine orders, 291; the theological side of the dispute: what constitutes a valid rite, 293; what is meant by the intention of the minister, 294; arguments from old and recent Roman theologians, 295; the intention of the Church for which a minister acts, 297; Macaulay's comments on Morrison's case, 298; proofs that the Church intended to maintain the 'Apostolic Succession,' 299; the argument that the Ordinal is to be interpreted by the private opinions of its framers, 300; the standards of belief in the Church of England, 302

Apocrypha, The (the Revised Version), 504

BAKER, Rev. R.S., Rationalism

Balfour, Mr. A. J.: his philosophy (review of A Defence of Philosophic Doubt and The Foundations of Belief), 47 sqq.: the author's qualifications appraised, 48; his object, 49; the two works compared, 50; Mr. Balfour's definitions, 54; his view of 'the relation of language to Belief,'56; of metaphysics, 57; of some consequences that must follow on the theory of 'Naturalism': in Ethics, 59, Determinism and Free Will, 60; Æsthetical consequences, 62; the 'Catechism of the Future' based on

principles of 'Naturalism,' 63; treatment of Empiricism, 65; of Idealism, 67; Philosophy and Rationalism, 68; 'Rationalist Orthodoxy,' 70; 'some causes of belief': Authority and Reason, 72; 'suggestions towards a Provisional Philosophy,' 75; the relations of Science and Religion, 78; miracles, 79; a confession of faith, 80; the Incarnation, 81; criticism of the constructive portion of Mr. Balfour's work, 82; signs of a better tendency in thought; M. scientific Brunetière's La Science et la Religion, 85; the ' school Ritschl,' 86

Dr. Willibald, New Beyschlag, Testament Theology; or, Historical Account of the Teaching of Jesus and of Primitive Christianity according to the New Testament Sources (trans. Rev. Neil

Buchanan), 226 Body, Rev. C. W. E., The Perma-

nent Value of the Book of Genesis as an Integral Part of the Christian Revelation (Paddock Lectures for 1894), 264 Boscawen, Mr. W. St. Chad, The

Bible and the Monuments, 545

Boyd Carpenter, Bishop (Ripon), Some Thoughts on Christian Reunion (Visitation Charges), 529

AILLARD, E. M., Progressive Revelation: or, Through Nature to God, 255

Carmina Vedastina (collected and edited by the Rev. Dr. Sparrow Simpson), 260

Carr, Mr. J. A., The Life and Times of James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, 521

Cheyne, Rev. Prof., Introduction to

the Book of Isaiah, 508 Chrystal, Mr. James, Authoritative Christianity: the Six Synods of the Undivided Church, its only Utterances, 234

Church, Dean, Pascal, and other Sermons, 539

Clayton, Rev. Horace E., The Morality of the Marriage Law, 262 DEU

Cobb, Mr. W. F., Origines Judaica, 549

Collins, Mr. J. Churton, Essays and Studies, 562

Confession of Faith, A (by an Unorthodox Believer), 238

Cutts, Rev. Dr. E. L., Augustine of Canterbury ('Leaders of Religion' series), 246

DANKO, J., Vetus Hymnarium Ecclesiasticum Hungaria,

559 Deuteronomy and the 'Higher Criticism' (Prof. Driver's Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy reviewed), 334 sqq.: importance of the work, 335; the question in regard to Deuteronomy between the critical and traditional schools, 337; Prof. Driver's opinion: it consists of a 'Mosaic nucleus expanded and developed,' 337; his argument criticized, 338; Sir W. Muir's view of the authorship of Deuteronomy, 340; the 'parenetic setting' examined, 341; a fallacy in Prof. Driver's argument, 342; the date he fixes, and his reasons for it: the 'difference between the laws of Deuteronomy and those of Exodus,' 344; 'the law . . . is coloured by reminiscences of the monarchy of Solomon,' 346; 'the mixed tribunals,' ib.; 'the forms of idolatry alluded to, 347; relations with late prophets, ib.; the language and style, 348; character of the prophetic teaching, 349; the forbidding of the setting up of a pillar, ib.; the reference to false prophets, 350; reasons for regarding Moses as 'historical,' 350 sqq.; the love of God for Israel was known to Moses, 352; psychological arguments connecting Moses with Deuteronomy, 353; consideration of some minor arguments, 355; the law of the one sanctuary, 356; the value of Deuteronomy to traditionalists, DIV

daica,

's and

n Un-

ustine

f Re-

rium

gariæ,

ligher

Criti-

entary

), 334

work,

rd to

criti-

337; t con-

us ex-

orship

'par-

41; a argu-

es, and

erence

; 'the

minis-

Solo-

lluded te pro-

and

e pro-

forbidpillar, e pro-

arding

sqq.;

el was

sycho-

necting

, 353;

he one

lue of nalists,

Sir

Divine Service, the early history of, 395 sqq.: works on the subject. by Pleithner, Bäumer, Batiffol, and Gevaert, 396; the 'Hours of Prayer' grew out of private devotion, 398; stages of growth: the Vigil, ib.; morning and evening services: Statio and Agape, 399; 'little Hours' of Terce, Sext and None, Prime and Compline, 401; growth of uniformity: the Psalter and the Bible, 402 Divine Service in the East in the fourth century, 403; details of method: morning service, 404; evening service, 405; the Vigil service, 406; modifications of the scheme introduced in the West, 407; the Mattin-Lauds service, 408; methods of using the Psalms, 409; the Rule of St. Isidore in Spain, 410; Mozarabic services, 411; Gallican services, 412; the Rules of St. Donatus and St. Columbus, 414; the Regula Magistri, 416; variety of use in Italy, 417; the Roman

and Benedictine forms, 418 Divorce, Present aspect of the controversy on, 422 sqq.: the amended edition of Dean Luckock's History of Marriage, 422; summary of the two sides of the argument from the New Testament evidence, 424; St. Paul's teaching is a repetition of that of our Lord, 426; rejection of the Bishop of Lincoln's interpretation of 'no longer two but one flesh,' 427; his treatment of Deut. xxiv. 1-4, 428; résumé of the teaching of the Fathers, 429; Conciliar evidence, 431; the practice of the East, ib.; the existing law of the Church in England: criticism of the Bishop of Lincoln's view of the language of the Prayer Book, and of the Canons, 432; the consideration of expediency rejected, 435; the 'innocent party,' the proposal to admit to Holy Communion 'remarried' divorced persons, 437; the need of up-holding the indissolubility of Christian marriage, 439

EDU

EDUCATIONAL crisis, The 1 sqq.: Mr. Forster's estimate of the education rate, I: causes of the excess of cost: rivalry of School Boards and Voluntary schools, 2; heavy strain upon supporters of the latter, 3; comparison of cost per child, and of teachers' salaries in each, 4; growth of Voluntary schools in spite of School Board rivalry, 5; unreasonable demands on them, 6; disenchantment of the people: the question of religious teaching, 7; the rights of parents, 8; changed views of Nonconformists, 9; undenominational religious teaching results in religious persecution, 10; magnitude of interests at stake, II; growing demand in the electorate for favourable treatment of Voluntary schools, 12; Unionist views: Mr. Balfour, 13; Sir M. Hicks-Beach and Mr. Chamberlain, 14; two principles to be contended for: perfect religious liberty for parents in determining the religious education of their children, 15 sq.; the pecuniary pressure on Voluntary schools: methods of relief considered, 17 sqq.; need of placing the property of Church schools on a sounder basis, 21; a permanent settlement of the education question must be aimed at, 22; united action desiderated, 23; Rev. H. Price Hughes's 'concordat' criticized, 24.-The agitation against Mr. Athelstan Riley and the 'Circular,' 489; views of Liberal leaders, 491; proposals formu-lated by the Archbishops' conference, 492; the Roman Catholic memorial to the Prime Minister, 494; its demands, 495; the Church deputation and memorial to the Government, 496; replies of the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Salisbury, 497; a Wesleyan counterblast, 499; Lord Salisbury's reply, 500; a declaration by the Roman Catholic bishops, 501; meeting of representatives of Diocesan Boards of Education, 502; views of Mr. George Dixon and of the Voluntary Schools Defence Union: reply of the Duke of Devonshire, 503

Everett, Rev. Canon, The Gift of the Keys and other Essays, 235

FOUARD, Abbé Constant, St. Paul and his Missions (trans.

George F. X. Griffith), 265 Freeman, E. A., the Life and Letters of, 108 sqq.: his early life, 109; precocious youth, 110; life and friendships at Oxford, 111; in Gloucestershire and Cardiff: literary work there, 112; at Somerleaze: extent and variety of his work, 113; the History of Federal Government, 114; the comparative advantages of larger and smaller states, 115; his interest in modern Greece, 116; hatred of Louis Napoleon, and of the Austrian Empire, 117; affection for republican institutions: the Landesgemeinde of Uri, 118; the Abbey of Einsiedeln: its romantic and prosaic sides, 119: a good hater: aversion to metaphysicians, 120; friendship with J. R. Green, 121; with Stubbs, Dawkins, and Dean Hook, 122; specimens of his general correspondence, 123; abhorrence of field-sports, ib.; his work in 1870-75, 125; his endeavours on behalf of Eastern Christians, 126; appointed Professor of Modern History, ib.; troubles of his later years, 127; wrath against the physical science party at Oxford, 128; the religious side of Freeman's character, 128

French, Bishop of Lahore, The Life and Correspondence of (by Rev. H. Birks), 372 sqq.: character of the work, 373; early life of French, 374; aspirations for a missionary life, 375; sent to Agra: the 'seven-tongued father,' 376; his everyday life in India, GOR

377; share in the incidents of the Mutiny, 379; return, invalided, to England, 380; again in India, 381; method as teacher, 382; feeling of the need of Catholic order and doctrine, 384; ideal of missionary work and character, 385; conduct as Bishop, 387; the founding of Lahore Cathedral, 388; labours during the Afghan wars, and missionary expedition to Persia, 390; resignation of the bishopric, and visit to the Lebanon, 391; account of a Moslem saint and of Moslem brotherhoods, 393; he founds a mission at Muscat, and dies there, 394

IBRALTAR Mission to Sea-

H

H

H

H

G men, Annual Report, 559 Gore, Rev. Canon, on the Incarnation and the Eucharist (Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation reviewed), 303 sqq.: the author's previous treatment of the subject of Christ's knowledge, 304; the impugned opinions are here repeated and emphasized, 306 sq.; the opposite opinion restated, 308; the appeal is to Holy Scripture in the light of the teaching of the Universal Church, 310; Canon Gore's treatment of patristic testimony, 311; three Fathers claimed as favouring his view: Irenæus, 313; Origen, 315; St. Gregory of Nyssa, 316; the author's reason for putting aside the great body of patristic testimony against him, 317; his treatment of Conciliar decrees, 318; consideration of his statement that the attitude of the Fathers was due to causes which belonged to their periods,' 320; it has been part of the work of the Church to formulate with accuracy the definitions of

unchanging truth, 324; Canon Gore's treatment of the doctrine of the Eucharist, 326; the cause

of the growth of the doctrine of

GOR

Transubstantiation, 328; objections to the use of the word, 330; the author's treatment of 'the Virgin Birth of our Lord,' 331; weak points in Canon Gore's

theological position, 333
Gore, Rev. Canon, The Creed of the Christian, 535

ents of

inva-

gain in

eacher,

ed of

e, 384;

k and as Bi-

Lahore

during

ionary

resig-

d visit

ount of

Ioslem

unds a

d dies

o Sea-

carna-

(Dis-

nnected

iewed),

revious

Christ's

pugned

ed and

oppo-

8; the

ture in

of the

Canon

atristic

athers

view:

15; St.

; the

g aside

tic tes-

7; his

lecrees,

s state-

of the

causes

eriods,

of the

rmulate

ions of

Canon

loctrine

e cause

trine of

559

Very Goulburn, Rev. Dean, Thoughts on Passages of Holy Scripture for the Sundays and Chief Holy Days of the Christian Year, 277

Greig, Rev. David, The New Criticism as bearing on our Use of the Old Testament, 230

HARRISON, Mr. Frederic, The Meaning of History, and other Historical Pieces, 272

Hefele, Bishop, A History of the Councils of the Church, from the Original Documents, vol. iv. (trans. W. R. Clark), 233

Hodgkin, Dr. T., Italy and her Invaders, vols. v. vi., 552 Hore, Mr. A. H., History of the

Church Catholic, 526 Hunter, Sir W. W., The Old Mis-

sionary, 555

Hutchings, Rev. Canon, Sermon-

Sketches taken from some of the Sunday Lessons throughout the Church's Year, 248

Huxley, Professor, and the 'New Reformation,' 151 sqq.; statement of Huxley's general theory of things, 151; analysis of his Lay Sermon (1866), 152; the 'search for natural causes': its beneficial results largely due to moral causes, 154; the Agnosticism of Christianity and of the New Philosophy contrasted, 155; the essay on Descartes, 156; the postulates of science, 158; causality, 159; the methods of science, 161; a modified theory of evolution, 162; the Gadarene miracle, 163; Descartes' certainty, 'self,' 164; Kant's scheme considered, 166; the principle that 'all Nature is a Mechanism, 168; Huxley's attitude towards Deism, 172; appreciation of his VOL. XLI.—NO. LXXXII.

services to the 'movement of opinion,' 173; the basis of the morality of the New Reformation, 174

Hyde, Rev. Dr. W. De Witt, Outlines of Social Theology, 275

I ACOBS, Mr. Joseph, Studies in Biblical Archæology, 257

Jowett, Benjamin, 440 sqq.: his intellectual character, 440; independence of thought and love of the golden mean displayed in his Sermons, 441; sober and cheerful view of life, 442; his sympathy with the suffering and trials of others: Toynbee Hall, 443; the proper use of life, 444; Mr. Tollemache's Personal Memoir of Jowett: its value, 445; comparison and contrast of Jowett and Mark Pattison, 446; Jowett's personal charm, ib. : inconsistency and contradiction, 447; his endeavour to be 'a philosopher, moralist, and preceptor, all at once,' 448; his estimate of men of mark, 449; transparent simplicity of his nature, 450

Judaistic Christianity (review of Dr. Hort's work), 187 sqq.: the relation of the Synagogue to the Christian Church, as represented in art, 187; Dr. Hort's treatment of the subject: meaning he attaches to 'Judaistic Christianity,' 189: our Lord's attitude towards Jewish institutions, 190; towards the different parts of Old Testament legislation, 191; the transition period: chronological difficulties in the Acts, 192; relation to Judaism of several classes of people mentioned there, 193; St. Stephen's speech, ib.; the incident of Cornelius, 194; the precepts of the Council of Jerusalem, ib.; St. Paul's treat-ment of them, 195; the conduct which he condemned in St. Peter, 196; attitude of Jews towards St. Paul, 197; meaning of φιλοσοφία in Col. ii. 8, 198; interpretation of various terms used in the Pastoral Epistles, 199;

KEMPIS, Thomas à, Meditations on the Life of Christ (ed. Rev. Dr. S. Kettlewell), 263 Kenyon, Mr. F. G., Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 543 Kettlewell, John, the Life and Times of (Anon.), 519

LAUD Commemoration, 1895 (Lectures, &c.: ed. W. E. Collins), 527 Lightfoot, Bishop, Historical Essays, 536 Lubbock, Sir John, The Use of Life, 239

M ACCOLL, Rev. Canon, Life Here and Hereafter (Sermons), 240 Maclagan, Archbishop (York), The Unity of Christendom, and Visitation Charge, 1895, 542

Mason, Rev. Dr. Arthur J., Lectures on Colet, Fisher, and More, at St. Paul's Cathedral, 1894, 268 Menzies, Rev. Prof. History of Re-

Menzies, Rev. Prof., History of Religion, 511
Moore, Rev. A. L., God is Love, and other Sermons, 278

Murphy, Rev. J. B. C., Plain-Spoken Sermons, 245

N ELSON and Naval Warfare, 451 sqq.: the necessity of naval power shown by Captain Mahan's The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, 452; Professor Laughton's Nelson, 453; Nelson's early years, ib.; service during the American war, 454; the French war of 1793: character of the French navy, 455; battle

PA

of June 1, 1794, 456; a period of inaction, 457; character of Admiral Jervis, 458; Nelson's share in the battle of Cape St. Vincent, 459; the attack on Teneriffe, 460; battle of the Nile, 461; Nelson's plan of action, 462; result of the battle, 463; Nelson and Lady Hamilton, 463 sq.; blockade of Brest, 464; battle of Copenhagen, 465; two legends exploded, 466; war of 1803, 467; Villeneuve's strategy foiled by Nelson, 468; battle of Trafalaga, and death of Nelson, 469; lessons which this war teaches, 470

OLIPHANT, Mrs., Historical Sketches of the Reign of Queen Anne, 250

PARLIAMENT of Religions, The,' An American Churchman on (Rev. Dr. Satterlee's A Creedless Gospel and the Gospel Creed), 176 sqq.: statement of the 'popular thought of the day' which was the basis of the 'Parliament,' 177; attempts to ignore or explain away sin, 178; substitution of a false Christ for the Christ of the Gospel, 179; Latitudinarianism contradictory to historical Christianity, ib.; misconception of the Church's 'first responsibility,' 180; the real object of the Apostles' mission, 181; statement of some central parts of the Church's Faith, 182; the Atonement and Resurrection, 183; the Divine side of the Church, 184; the Sacraments, 185; contrast of the 'Creedless Gospel' and the 'Gospel Creed,' 186

Pastor's History of the Popes (vols. iii. iv.), 88 sgg.: election of Pius II., 89; his proposals of reform, 90; his attempt to convert Mahomet II., 91; his policy and methods, 92; crusade against the Turks, 93; his resolve to head the expedition, 94; the Bull of

PEN

the Crusade, 95; its results, 96; his deathbed address to the Cardinals, 97; estimate of his character, 98; Paul II.: Platina's account of him contrasted with Pastor's, 100; details of his election, 101; his character, 102; election of Sixtus IV., ib.; his nepotism, 103; character of his nephews, 104 sq.; specimen of Dr. Pastor's method of defending conduct he does not wholly approve, 105; Sixtus IV. as patron of art and learning, and second founder of the Vatican Library,

Pennington, Rev. Canon, Recollections of Persons and Events, 532 Persecutions, the early, the Rationale of, 26 sqq.: development of the causes of persecution: Christianity treated as a sect of Judaism, 27; causes of St. Paul's trials: at Philippi, 28; at Thes-salonica, Corinth, Ephesus, 29; before a Roman procurator, and before Festus: the appeal to Cæsar, 30; what came of it, 31; popular grounds of odium to Christianity, 33; social theories of Christians, 34; the charge of 'sacrilegium': its meaning, 34; charges suggested by the secrecy of their worship, 35; origin of the Neronian persecution, 36; method of procedure in the trials, 37; evidence of persecutions and their causes in the succeeding years: Domitian, 38; correspondence of Pliny and Trajan, 39; Hadrian's rescript to Fundanus, ib.; Marcus Aurelius: the persecution of Gallican Christians, 40; few Emperors personally set on foot attacks upon Christians, 41; Commodus: the Madaurian and Scillitan martyrs, ib.; cause of the martyrdoms of Perpetua and her companions, 42; Maximin's persecution, 43; systematic persecution under Decius and Valerian, ib.; period of toleration, 44; causes of Diocletian's persecution, 45; its extent, 46; the RUS

Great Edict of Milan brought

peace, 47
Phillips Brooks, Bishop (Massachusetts), Essays and Addresses, Religious, Literary, and Social (ed. Rev. J. Cotton Brooks), 269
Practical Reflections on Every Verse of the Prophet Isaiah (Preface by Bishop of Lincoln), 279

RIGG, Dr., on the Oxford Movement (Oxford High Anglicanism and its Chief Leaders), 359 sqq.: general character of the work, 359; specimens of its philippics, 360; the author's lack of knowledge about Oxford, 361; curious notions about 'fellowships,' 362; his estimate of Charles Marriott, 363; of Keble and Pusey, 364; Pusey's controversy with Rose, 365; Keble's Chris-tian Year, 366; Dr. Rigg's opinions about Dean Butler, Newman, Ward, and Faber, 367; low opinion of the Christian Fathers, 368; of the great English public schools, 369; of Dean Church's Oxford Movement, ib.; of Newman's Apologia, 370; of Canon Liddon's Life of Pusey, 371:—Mr. Wakeling's The Oxford Church Movement contrasted with Dr. Rigg's work, 37 I sq.

Russian Bible, The, 203 sqq.: the beginning of Russian literary history, 204; early Slav versions of the Bible, 205; MS. authorities for study of the Russian Bible, 206; the Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets, 208; linguistic value of the MSS., 209; points of grammatical interest, 210; value of textual criticism, 211; does the version come from one or from many rival translations? 213; fortunes of the Bible in Russia: the translation by Cyril and Methodius, 215; spread of copies of the texts, commentaries and catenæ, 216; extent of knowledge of the Scriptures in Russia in the eleventh century, 217;

nis policy le against re to head e Bull of

iod of

f Ad-

share

ncent,

eriffe,

461;

462; Velson

\$ 59. ;

attle of

egends

3, 467;

ed by

falgar,

; les-

es, 470

storical

ign of

ligions,

lee's A

Gospel

at of the

y' which

iament,

explain on of a t of the

rianism

d Chris-

n of the

sibility,

of the

state-

parts of 82; the

rrection,

raments, Creedless

! Creed,

pes (vols.

ction of

posals of

t to con-

of the

disastrous results of invasion of Mongols, ib.; new versions later, 218; classification of different recensions, 219; account of the printed Russian Bible, 200; in the time of Peter the Great, 222; the revision of 1744, 223; the Russian Bible Society (1812), ib.; more recent efforts to spread the Scriptures, 224

Ryle, Rev. Prof., Philo and Holy Scripture, 551

SALT, Mr. Henry S., Selections from Thoreau, 253 Sandford, Bishop (Gibraltar), A Pastoral Letter, 557

Seeley, Sir J. R., Lectures and Essays, 563

Smith, Mr. Garnet, The Melancholy of Stephen Allard: a Private Diary, 243

Diary, 243
Social Problem, Aspects of the (by Various Writers: ed. Bernard

Bosanquet), 275
Stanton, Professor: a reply to his
Article (in the Economic Review)
on our criticisms of the Christian
Social Union, 471 sqq.; restatement of our position, 472; the
Professor's interpretation, 474;
errors of statement therein, 475;
distinction between a world which
is conditionally good and a world
which is evil, 476; the former, if
realizable, is by the conditions
transitory, 477; enmity with

WOO

the world is the condition of the pilgrimage, 478; Christian's Christianity makes good citizens, but as an indirect effect, 478 the direct concern of ministers of Christ is with the spiritual environment alone, 480; Professor Stanton's plea that the improve-ment of 'environment' will help to save many of the weaker shoots, 481: but in all ages saints and martyrs have been most numerous in the very classes referred to, 483; the influence of surroundings &c. can reach far, but not to the one thing needful, 484; repudiation of the definite reforms aimed at by Socialists: e.g. the abolition of private property, &c., 485; other reasons for opposing Socialism, 486; for Christians no ideal secular polity is revealed as proper to pursue, 487; our criticism of Bishop Westcott's opinions on Socialism, ib.

Stoughton, Rev. Dr., Lights and Shadows of Church Life, 514

TRAVERS SMITH, Rev Canon, The Church in France, 518

WOODHOUSE, Mr. R. J., The Life of John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, 524

PRINTED BY

SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

an of the 478; citizens, ct, 478; citizens, ct, 478; isters of ual enrofessor mprove-vill help rshoots, nts and to nume-referred of surfar, but ful, 484; reforms e.g. the rty, &c., ppposing tians no realed as our criti-

tt's opihts and , 514

Rev France,

R. J., Morton, y, 524